

The Classical Review

MAY 1894.

ARISTOTLE'S SUBDIVISIONS OF 'PARTICULAR JUSTICE.'

ON the initial distinction made in *Eth. Nic.* v. between 'General' and 'Particular' Justice there is no dispute. General Justice is Righteousness or Rightness of conduct; it is the fulfilling of the whole law, written and unwritten. We call virtuous conduct 'just' in this wide sense when we look at it in relation to its effect on others (c. 1 § 20, 1130a 12): the coward or the debauchee may be called, in this wide sense, 'unjust,' when we consider how his conduct affects others. Particular Justice, on the other hand, is a special virtue alongside of such virtues as Courage and Temperance: there may be unjust acts which are not acts of cowardice or debauchery or of any of the special vices. Of Particular Justice we are told (c. 2 § 12, 1130b 30) that there are two species—one which is exhibited in distributions of honour, property or anything else which is divisible among those who share in the commonwealth, another which is corrective in the case of contracts (*τὸ ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι διορθωτικόν*). Of this latter there are two divisions; for of contracts some are voluntary, and some are involuntary. Voluntary contracts are e.g. buying, selling, lending at interest, pledging, lending without interest, depositing, letting for hire: and they are called voluntary, because they rise out of voluntary acts [*i.e.* voluntary on the part of *both* the parties to the contract]. Of involuntary contracts some are furtive (*λαθραία*), e.g. theft, adultery, poisoning, procuring, enticement of slaves, assassination, false witness; others violent (*βίασα*), e.g. assault, imprison-

ment, murder, rape, maiming, slander, contumelious treatment.' I have followed Mr. Jackson's translation of the names of the various voluntary and involuntary contracts.

In passing from the discussion of Distributive to that of Corrective Justice (c. 4 § 1, 1131b 25) Aristotle speaks of the latter as the *one* remaining kind—*τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐν τῷ διορθωτικῷ, ὃ γίνεται ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι καὶ τοῖς ἐκουσίοις καὶ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις*. In chapter 5, Aristotle applies the conception of *τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός* (which the Pythagoreans had used as their one formula for Justice) to the case of commercial exchanges. Hence it has sometimes been assumed that chapter 5 deals with that subdivision of Corrective Justice which is concerned with voluntary contracts, of which buying and selling are conspicuous examples, chapter 4 being held to treat only of that subdivision of Corrective Justice which is concerned with involuntary contracts, *i.e.* with the remedying of wrongs arising out of fraud or force. Against this view I think the words of c. 5 § 2, 1132b 23 are decisive: it is there explicitly said that the conception of *ἀντιπεπονθός* does not suit either Distributive or Corrective Justice. It may be objected that in c. 5 § 2 Aristotle only says that *τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός κατ' ἰσότητα* is inapplicable either in Distributive or in Corrective Justice; but I think the obvious interpretation of his words is to take the denial as

¹ Michael of Ephesus appears to have read *τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν εἶδος*; this would make no difference in the sense.

affecting τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός generally. The distinction between equal and proportionate reciprocity is not introduced until § 6, 1132b 33. The inappropriateness of the conception of τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός to Distributive Justice seems to be assumed without proof. As applied to Corrective Justice, it would mean 'Retaliation'—the term often used, inaccurately I think, to translate τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός throughout this chapter. The theory that Corrective Justice is the *lex talionis* Aristotle rejects. The conception of Reciprocity (Requit, Mutuality of conditions, or however it is to be translated) Aristotle admits only in associations of exchange—ἐν ταῖς κοινωνίαις ταῖς ἀλλακτικαῖς—and then only if we apply the conception of Reciprocity proportionately and not accordingly to strict equality (κατ' ἀναλογίαν καὶ μὴ κατ' ἰσότητα).

In spite of Euclid's use of τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθόν for 'reciprocal proportion' it may perhaps be thought rash to translate τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός κατ' ἀναλογίαν by 'reciprocal proportion,' especially since in Aristotle's illustrations of just or fair exchanges the formula of reciprocal proportion is not applied with quite the same strictness as is the formula of direct geometrical proportion in Distributive Justice or the formula of the arithmetical mean in Corrective Justice. In § 8 the reciprocity only comes in in the sense that, after the products of the builder and the shoemaker have been equalized, the exchange implies a cross-movement (ἡ κατὰ διάμετρον σύζευξις).¹ To produce the equalization necessary before a fair exchange can take place, a formula of proportion is used, but it is direct proportion: εἰαν οὖν πρῶτον ἡ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἴσον, εἴτα τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός γένηται etc. (1133a 10). I feel no doubt—in spite of what has been said by good authorities to the contrary—that Aristotle *does* think of different kinds of producers having different social values: and we can easily give an economic meaning to what he says by understanding the ratio between two producers *A* and *B* to mean the ratio between the value of an hour of *A*'s labour and the value of an hour of *B*'s labour. As *A* is to *B* (in this sense), then, so is a unit of *A*'s product to a unit of *B*'s in value for purposes of exchange. For convenience let us call the products of *A* and *B*, *a* and *β* respectively, rather than *C* and *D*, as Aristotle calls them. Then suppose that $A = 3B$, $a = 3β$

in value. This equalization is arrived at by a direct proportion; and when it has once been effected, exchange must take place 'crosswise,' *A* receiving $3β$, while *B* receives $1a$; but there must now be no further talk of proportion, else one of the two parties, the one already favoured in the process of equalization, would be having his superiority counted over again. This is the only intelligible interpretation I can see for c. 5 § 12, 1133a 33—b 5 (εἰς σχῆμα δ' ἀναλογίας οὐ δεῖ ἄγειν etc.).

An explicit reference to the geometrical formula of reciprocal proportion is however suggested by the first sentence of § 12, 1133a 31: 'Reciprocity will be produced, when the parties have been equalized, so that as farmer to shoemaker, so is the shoemaker's product [*sc.* which the farmer receives] to the farmer's product [which the shoemaker receives].' Using the same terms as before, we get 'reciprocal proportion' in this sense, that 'As *A* is to *B* in value, so must be the amount of *β* which *A* receives to the amount of *a* which *B* receives.' But it is to be observed that if $A : B :: 3 : 1$, we cannot say, 'As $A : B :: 3β : 1a$ '; for this would be to do the very thing which Aristotle says in 1133b 1, 2 we must not do. And therefore if *β* meant the product of *B* already equalized with some unit of *A*'s product (τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἰσασμένον Δ, 1133b 5), we could not say 'As $A : B :: β : a$.' So that even in § 12 τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός may mean simply that mutuality of conditions which is the essence of exchange rather than the mathematical formula taken strictly. If however Aristotle does mean, as is quite possible, to use the formula of reciprocal proportion, this only affords an additional argument for regarding chapter 5 as dealing with a different division of Justice from those dealt with in chapters 3 and 4. We have three distinct mathematical formulae: (1) direct geometrical proportion, (2) arithmetical proportion—or, more properly, the finding of the arithmetical mean, and (3) reciprocal proportion; and we may reasonably expect to find a separate division of Justice corresponding to each. For this third kind of particular Justice we may invent the name of 'Catallactic' or 'Commutative Justice.'

To this conclusion the following objections may be made: (1) that in c. 4 § 1 (1131b 25) Aristotle distinctly says that Corrective Justice is the one kind remaining to be treated of after Distributive Justice has been discussed; (2) that in c. 2 § 13 (1131a 1) Corrective Justice is sub-

¹ Mr. Jackson has pointed out the error of the traditional diagram of a parallelogram with diagonal lines drawn. See his edition of the *Fifth Book of the Ethics*, p. 95.

divided into two species, and that Corrective Justice dealing with voluntary contracts may be identified with the kind of Justice described in c. 5; (3) that in c. 5 § 6 (1132b 31) proportionate reciprocity is said to be the basis of civil society (τῷ ἀντιποιεῖν ἀνάλογον συμφέειν ἢ πόλις) by regulating the requital of evil as well as the requital of good. With the second of these objections I have already dealt, in part at least. The third objection, it should be noted, is inconsistent with the second: c. 5 § 6, 1132b 31 suggests, not that Commutative Justice is one of the species of Corrective Justice, but that Corrective Justice is one of the species of Commutative Justice: and this is precisely what we find in Thomas Aquinas's adaptation of the Aristotelian theory (*Summa* 2a. 2ae. qu. 61, art 1, 3). I quote from the convenient abbreviated translation of Father Rickaby (*Aquinas Ethics*, vol. ii. pp. 22 seq.):—

'Particular Justice is in relation to some private person who stands to the community as a part to the whole. Now to a part we may either have another part related; and that expresses the relation of one private person to another, which relation is regulated by *commutative justice* [*et hunc ordinem dirigit commutativa justitia*], or the justice that is concerned with the mutual dealings of two private persons one with another: or again we have the relation of the whole to the part; and such is the relation of the community to the individual, which relation is presided over by *distributive justice* [*quem quidem ordinem dirigit justitia distributiva*] or the justice that distributes the goods of the common stock according to proportion. And therefore there are two species of justice, *distributive* and *commutative*..... Distributive justice presides over distributions [*est directiva distributionum*], while commutative justice presides over the exchanges [*est directiva commutationum*] that may take place between two individuals. Of these exchanges some are *involuntary*, some *voluntary*. Those are *involuntary* in which one uses the thing or person or service of another against his will. This is done sometimes by fraud, sometimes by open violence..... In all transactions such as those enumerated, whether voluntary or involuntary, the same principle holds of fixing the mean according to an even balance of *give and take* [*secundum aequalitatem recompensationis*]. And therefore the said transactions all belong to one species of justice, namely, *commutative*.'

In Article 4, under the same 'Question,'

Thomas Aquinas lays down that the Just in Commutative Justice is identical with Requital (*contrapassum*), but not in Distributive Justice. From all that he says in this part of the *Summa* and also from his *Commentary on the Ethics* it is quite clear that Aquinas considers that he is only following the opinion of 'the philosopher.' And there is no doubt that the traditional merging of Corrective and Commutative Justice by Aristotelian commentators is greatly due to the example set by Aquinas. Father Rickaby in his own work on *Moral Philosophy, or Ethics and Natural Law*, which may be taken as a good specimen of Thomist ethics of the present day, introduces 'punishments' among the 'matters distributed' by Distributive Justice (p. 104). But this seems to me to go beyond any possible interpretation of Aristotle, and to be a concession to the modern conception of Crime, as distinct from civil injury. Although, in this very book of the *Ethics*, Aristotle decides that the suicide commits a wrong against the State (c. 11 § 3, 1138a 11), yet, as we have seen, he regards assaults and murders as giving occasion simply for a kind of Justice, which has to restore the interrupted equality between individuals. Aristotle does indeed recognize that the use of such terms as 'loss' and 'gain' in involuntary contracts is a metaphor from their proper use in commercial transactions (c. 4 § 13, 1132b 12). But his theory of Judicial Justice (if one may use the expression) adheres to the primitive type of penal law, which, as Maine expresses it, 'is not the law of Crimes, but the law of Wrongs or, to use the English technical word, of Torts' (*Ancient Law*, p. 370). Even when he regards the suicide as committing an injury against the State, Aristotle probably conceives this injury 'on the analogy of a personal wrong'—to use the phrase employed by Maine in speaking of the conception in early Roman jurisprudence of wrongs done to the State (*ibid.* 372). In the *Rhetoric* (i. 13, 1373b 23, 24) Aristotle distinguishes between wrongs done to a determinate individual (πρὸς ἓνα καὶ ὀρισμένον) and wrongs done πρὸς τὸ κοινόν. Adultery and assault are given as examples of the former class, evading military service of the latter—ὁ γὰρ μοιχεύων καὶ τύπτων ἀδικεῖ τινὰ τῶν ὀρισμένων, ὁ δὲ μὴ στρατευόμενος τὸ κοινόν. Mr. Welldon's translation ('for adultery and assault are crimes against particular persons, but the refusal of military service is a crime against the State') seems to me unfortunate in introducing the

term 'crime' at all. Wrongs to determinate individuals are 'involuntary contracts' and form the occasion for Corrective Justice. On the other hand I think it probable that Aristotle would have regarded the evasion of military service as a violation of Distributive Justice, on the principle laid down in *Eth. Nic.* v. 3 § 15, 1131b 20—that the lesser evil is to be reckoned as good: the citizen who evades any public obligation, e.g. the payment of a tax, service in the army, etc., has taken to himself an unfair amount of the good things which the community secures to its members and has thrown an unfair burden on others. The wrong done by the suicide is probably to be interpreted in the same way; he has deprived the State of his services without permission. But the penalty inflicted by the State on the deserter and the ἀρπία inflicted as a punishment on the suicide (c. 11 § 3) would in Aristotle's eyes be matters of Corrective, not of Distributive, Justice.

It is interesting to see in Aquinas and his followers what becomes of Aristotelian theories. But we cannot take Aquinas's interpretation as proving anything more than that Aristotle's words seemed to him to have a certain meaning. It is important therefore to consider in what form Aristotle's words reached him. Aquinas read the *Ethics* and the *Politics* in the version of William of Moerbek. Now in this old translation the words of c. 2 § 12, 1130b 30 are rendered as follows: '*Una autem quae in commutationibus directiva.*' In c. 4 § 1, 1131b 25, we find: '*Reliqua autem una directivum* [sic] *ejus quod sit et in voluntariis commutationibus et involuntariis.*' In these passages Aquinas's attention was obviously attracted by the phrase '*in commutationibus*' and not by the vague word '*directiva*,' which fails to give the force of διορθωτικόν. In the sentences which I quoted above from the *Summa* it will be observed that Aquinas uses *directiva* and *dirigit* of Distributive as well as of Corrective Justice: so that he has clearly missed the significance of the term διορθωτικόν. The absorption of Corrective in Commutative Justice—a view which seems to fit in well enough with c. 5 § 6 (1132b 34) but not with §§ 2, 3, 4 (1132b 23—31)—is, I think, sufficiently explained, so far as concerns mediaeval moralists and all whom they have influenced, by the language of the 'old translation.'

As to the second objection—that drawn from the subdivisions in c. 2 § 13—I do not think that the passage need be interpreted

in such a way as to lead us to expect a special treatment of Corrective Justice in relation to voluntary contracts. Aristotle frequently elaborates divisions and subdivisions without following up his classification with a correspondingly elaborate discussion in detail. In this very passage we have the distinction between τὰ λαθραία and τὰ βίαια laid down and illustrated, but not followed up by any further use of the distinction. In the same way I think that chapter 4 deals with Corrective Justice both in voluntary and involuntary contracts, no distinction being made, such as would be made in modern Jurisprudence, between the principles of civil and criminal law. Aristotle recognizes what is roughly parallel to a difference of spheres, but no difference in principle. As already said, assaults and murders are treated as matters to be remedied by equalization, i.e. by an assessment of damages (though of course the 'damages' may amount to the surrender of the life of the wrong-doer) on the same principle as the failure to pay a debt or to repay a loan. It seems to me quite certain that Corrective Justice is intended to apply to voluntary contracts, only when the terms of the contract have not been fulfilled: otherwise there is no case for a plaintiff to bring before a law-court. On this matter Mr. Jackson seems to me perfectly right in his interpretation. (See his edition of *Eth. Nic.* v. p. 76.) There can be no rectification, till a wrong has been committed. I cannot agree with Mr. Stewart's ingenious suggestion (*Notes*, vol. i. pp. 415, 416) that Corrective Justice in Aristotle's sense is exercised by a land-court, revising leases, the strict enforcement of which seems to involve hardship. Such revisions of voluntary contracts or non-enforcement of the strict letter of voluntary contracts would, I feel sure, have been considered by Aristotle as cases of ἐπιείκεια—ἐπανορθώματα νομίμου δικαίου—and not as cases of Corrective Justice, as that is described in c. 4. Nay, as such 'correction of legal justice' (as distinct from correction by legal justice) requires special legislation to bring it about or a special interference on the part of the executive, it would rather fall under Aristotle's head of Distributive Justice. But I do not think that Aristotle is taking account of σιειάχθαι or γῆς ἀναδασμοί or any such exceptional measures in any part of his theory of Justice. Mr. Stewart admits that Aristotle had not any such cases of rectification in his mind 'when he drew up his list of ἐκούσια συναλλάγματα' in c. 2, § 13.

In bringing economic distribution under the conception of ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν διανομή, Mr. Stewart (*Notes*, i. pp. 417, 418, 432, 449) seems to be going beyond any warrant to be found in Aristotle. Aristotle means by 'distribution' the formal assignment of power, office, &c., to different persons or classes in a constitution. Thus 'one man, one vote' would be in accordance with democratical distributive justice: the Prussian 'three-class system' in which votes count for more according to the amount of direct taxes paid, or the present English system of assigning votes in the election of poor-law guardians according to the amount of rates paid, would be examples of distribution on the principles of oligarchical justice; in the ideal state political power would be proportionate to merit, if that could be ascertained. Thus too in an association other than the State, the payment of dividends according to the amount of shares would be Distributive Justice; but Distributive Justice would have nothing to do with the market value of these shares, nor in general with the wealth or poverty of different persons and classes, which arises not from any direct assignment of rewards or burdens by the State, but simply from the operation of what we call 'economic laws.' Though in the *Politics* (i. 8-11) he has the conception of a distinct but subordinate science of wealth (χρηματιστική), Aristotle does not anywhere suggest the notion that industrial and commercial competition would of itself bring about Distributive Justice: and I do not think that he would have accepted the notion, if it had been propounded to him. His criticisms of constitutions in which the legislator has allowed great inequalities to grow up and his own express provisions for the διανομή of land among the citizens (*Pol.* vii. 10. 1329b 40) imply a political and ethical distrust of the unchecked operation of what we call 'economic laws.'

Mr. Stewart (p. 433 and *Classical Review* vol. vii. p. 182) pleads the authority of the *Magna Moralia* i. c. 34, in support of this introduction of economic considerations into the conception of Distributive Justice. But (1) when the writer of *M. M.* says (1194a 1) 'that he who has worked much should receive much and that he who has worked little should receive little,' this is quite a fair illustration of Distribution in Aristotle's sense. It is Distribution on principles of proportion according to whatever standard (ἀξία) be adopted. If the wages in a certain trade are so much per hour, the labourer who has worked eight hours receives twice as

much as he who has worked only four; but what determines the amount of wages per hour in the trade is a question which Aristotle does not bring in Distributive Justice to decide; and yet this is just the question which concerns the modern economist dealing with the problem of 'the distribution of wealth.' (2) In what follows, the author of the *M. M.*, referring to Plato's *Republic*, goes on to introduce the question of economic exchange which is discussed in *Eth. Nic.* v. 5, though he treats it in much slighter fashion. In the *M. M.* there is however no subdivision of Particular Justice and no express mention of either 'Corrective' or 'Distributive Justice.' The writer simply shows that Justice involves the idea of equality—in the sense of proportionate equality, giving as illustrations the ratio of taxation to property and of wages to amount of labour. The latter illustration leads to a reference to Plato's *Republic* ii. 369. The formula of justice in exchange is 'As the farmer is to the builder, so is the builder to the farmer.' Since the products are not always of equal value, money is needed for equalization. Then the writer goes on to say: ἔστι δὲ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός, οὐ μέντοι γε ὥς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔλεγον (1194a 28); but he applies the conception of τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός only to punishment and not at all to economic exchange. Thus, important as the *Magna Moralia* may be as representing an early traditional version of Aristotelian ethical theory, I do not think that much stress can be laid upon it in regard to this part of Book v. One might almost conjecture that the writer had before him a defective copy of the Aristotelian text, in which chapters 3 and 4 were wanting and chapter 5 imperfect. Or is it possible that this part of *M. M.* is descended from some older draft of the Aristotelian theory than what is elaborated in *Eth. Nic.* v. 1? In any case I think one must agree with Mr. H. Richards (in *Classical Review* vol. vii. p. 251) when he says that the writer of the *M. M.* used a wider and vaguer formula which embraces both Distributive Justice and Justice in Exchange, and is not regarding the latter as a subdivision of the former any more than *vice versa*. Michael of Ephesus, commenting on *Eth. Nic.* v. 5, refers to the *M. M.* as explaining the matter more clearly: the account in the *M. M.* is clearer indeed, but simply because it is slight and superficial.

If, then, the kind of Justice described in chapter 5 §§ 1-16, cannot be absorbed in Cor-

rective Justice or in Distributive Justice, or in any way amalgamated with either or both of these, can any satisfactory account be given of this passage, without resorting to the desperate measure of proposing unverifiable rearrangements of the text? First of all it should be noticed that the subject of Reciprocity is introduced indirectly by a reference to Pythagorean opinion on the subject of Justice generally. The connexion of thought between c. 5 §§ 1-16 and the preceding part of Book v. may, I think, be represented as follows—interpolated comments are enclosed in square brackets:—

‘Particular Justice in both its forms has been explained in terms of mathematical formulae. [To use mathematical conceptions in ethics was for the Greeks to make ethics ‘scientific,’ to take the subject out of the level of mere popular moralizing by using the conceptions of the only science which by that time had made conspicuous progress and so come to be the type of scientific thought.] But it was the Pythagoreans who first introduced these mathematical formulae into ethics. They, however, defined Justice simply as ‘Reciprocity.’ [They really meant by this, apparently, the number multiplied into itself—the square (4 or 9) as a symbol of Justice. Cf. Alexander Aphrod. on *Met.* 985b 26. The passage is quoted by Mr. Jackson and by Mr. Stewart in their notes on this chapter of the *Ethics*. Again, as Mr. Stewart points out in his note on 1132b 21 (i. p. 445), the pseudo-Archytas, who at any rate ‘hoped to pass for a Pythagorean,’ applies the conception of τὸ ἀντιπεπονθέναι to the Spartan state, as a balanced constitution, in which the same magistracy might in turn be superior and subject: τὸ δὲ ἀντιπεπονθέναι λέγω αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄρχην καὶ ἄρχεσθαι τὴν αὐτὴν ἄρχάν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐνομωτάτῃ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ. There is, in any case, little reason to believe that the Pythagoreans really intended their conception of justice as τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός to mean merely ‘tit for tat.’ They were taking a mathematical term to express the general idea of correspondence or symmetry or balance—all of which terms we might use in trying to explain what is meant by a ‘just’ arrangement, a ‘fair’ system of government, &c.] But the formula of Reciprocity [as Aristotle chooses to understand it] will not fit either of the species of Justice we have distinguished. It will not fit Distributive Justice; because [I suppose—Aristotle himself has given no reason—] the notion of Reciprocity applied in distribution would imply an exact reversal of the notion

of giving to each his due: it would mean giving less to the better and more to the worse. Nor will it fit Corrective Justice: applied to Corrective Justice, Reciprocity would mean Retaliation, and exact Retaliation is not just, (1) because the mere physical injury is no precise measure of the real wrong committed, e.g. a blow inflicted on an official is a greater wrong than the same blow inflicted on a private person; and (2) because we must take account of the intention of the person who inflicts the hurt and not of the mere physical injury (§§ 4, 5). Nevertheless, on our principle of looking for an element of truth in all current opinion (cf. *Eth. Nic.* i. 8 § 1, 1098b 10; vii. 1 § 5, 1145b 2 &c.), we may reasonably expect to find some ground for the Pythagorean conception of Justice. In the case of voluntary exchanges, to which we have just been referring as the sphere from which we borrow the terms ‘loss’ and ‘gain’ employed in discussing Corrective Justice (c. 4, § 13, 1132b 12), we regard what is just or fair as depending on a sort of Reciprocity—not exact quantitative requital (for that would not be fair, as it would not take account of the different values of different kinds of work), but Reciprocity determined by proportion. Such proportionate Reciprocity is the indispensable condition of civil society. Civil society, as Plato says [I take the hint of a reference to Plato’s *Republic* from the *M. M.*], comes into being to meet the mutual economic wants of different persons; but it would not meet these wants, unless they got a fair equivalent for their respective products. And this idea of a fair equivalent appears also in the notion of Reciprocity as applied to wrong-doing, though we have just seen that the notion of Reciprocity is not applicable in the literal sense of a *lex talionis*. People do not consider themselves freemen, unless they can get a fair equivalent for wrongs done to them (δουλεία δοκεῖ εἶναι, εἰ μὴ ἀντιποιήσῃ).’

How the conception of Reciprocity is worked out in commercial exchanges I have already shown. The hint of its application to the remedying of wrongs will enable us to reconcile the seeming contradiction between c. 4 § 3, 1132a 1, where it is said that the equality of Corrective Justice is exact and not proportionate equality, and c. 5 § 4, 1132b 28, where it is denied that an exact equivalent is just requital. We now see that the effect of Corrective Justice must be to leave the parties ‘quits,’ but in the assessment of the amount of wrong that has to be redressed we must take account of

a principle of proportion (e.g. as an official is to a private person, so is the knocking off of an official's hat to the knocking off of a private person's hat). Here, however, just as in the case of commercial bargains, there must be no talk of proportion *after* the equalization has once been made in terms of this proportion (cf. 5 § 12).

I have here attempted to work out the suggestion of Reciprocity with respect to wrongs on the analogy of its application to commercial exchange. But I do not thereby mean to regard Corrective Justice as a subspecies of Commutative. Commutative or Catallactic Justice (Aristotle has given no name to it) seems to me brought in by an afterthought to explain Aristotle's attitude to the Pythagorean formula. But I do not think Aristotle would have considered this addition inconsistent with his previous recognition of two kinds only of Particular Justice; for I do not think he means Catallactic Justice to stand on the same level as the other two. Both Distributive and Corrective Justice imply a definitely organized State, and are in strictness applicable only to the citizens of the same State, they are both parts of the *Jus Civile*, and they correspond moreover to the divisions of Public and Private Law. Catallactic Justice, on the other hand, may exist between those who are not citizens of the same State.¹ An Athenian for example may export wine to Egypt and may import corn (cf. 5 § 13, 1133b 9), and the bargain he makes may be fair or unfair; but if, when the bargain is once made, one of the parties does not abide by his contract, e.g. does not deliver the goods he has contracted to deliver, or does not pay for the goods he has received, the aggrieved party has no remedy unless in virtue of some special treaty or privilege he is allowed to sue in the courts of the other's country. So too with the notion, which Aristotle does not develop, of Reciprocity in things evil. An Athenian may offend an Egyptian, and the Egyptian may 'pay him out'—hurting him in due proportion—and we may pronounce the transaction fair or

unfair, quite apart from any judicial decision, which, as already said, is only available between citizens, unless there is some special treaty allowing aliens to sue. (Such treaties are referred to by Aristotle in *Pol.* iii. 1 § 4, 1275a 10; 9 §§ 6, 7, 1280a 36 seq.). The fairness or unfairness of bargains as such, the fairness or unfairness of reprisals between individuals or nations who are in 'a state of nature' to one another belong to a kind of Justice which is, so to speak, below the level of τὸ πολιτικὸν δίκαιον (*Jus civile*) proper, although it is a kind of Justice without which civil society could not hold together, nay, could not exist. The definite theory of a *Jus naturale* which would apply if there were no *Jus civile* is indeed post-Aristotelian, though the κοινὸς νόμος of the *Rhet.* i. cc. 10, 13, 15 comes very near it.² I do not think however one can identify the Justice whose principle is τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς with τὸ φυσικὸν δίκαιον as opposed to τὸ νομικὸν δίκαιον: for the more nearly any State approaches to the ideal, the more nearly will its *Jus Civile* (πολιτικὸν δίκαιον) be φυσικὸν δίκαιον and not merely νομικόν. Τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς is rudimentary, rather than ideal, justice. This ambiguity between the 'natural' as the ideal and as the rudimentary recurs in all the theories which work with the idea of a *Jus naturale*, and exists in Aristotle's own conception of φύσις.

Recurring to the hint supplied by Plato's *Republic* ii. 369 B, one might rearrange the kinds of Justice in the reverse order, in an ascending instead of a descending scale. (1) There must be fair exchanges between human beings in order to satisfy their mutual wants, else there would be no κοινωρία at all beyond the family and the village community (cf. *Pol.* i. 2). But (2) a State (πόλις) exists for many purposes beyond this of satisfying economic wants: there must at least be law-courts in which the citizens can get their wrongs remedied, without having recourse to reprisals. But (3), in the opinion of both Plato and Aristotle, a State must do very much more than guarantee private rights (the theory of Lycophron the Sophist, referred to in *Pol.* iii. 9 § 8, 1280b 10): it should provide for its citizens the proper sphere in which each may perform the functions for which he is best fitted. This is the problem of Distributive Justice, which in the best State will adopt the

² It should be noted, however, that Aristotle seems only to refer to the κοινὸς νόμος as a generally received notion, which may, when it is convenient, be used as a rhetorical commonplace: 'No case, talk about the law of nature and quote the *Antigone*' (*Rhet.* i. 15. 1375a 27 seq.).

¹ It is interesting to note that, in opposition to the traditional view about Aristotle's subdivision of Particular Justice into Distributive and Commutative, Pufendorf (*De Jure Naturae et Gentium*, i. c. 7 § 12) holds that Aristotle has three species of Particular Justice, but recognizes a difference between the first two (Distributive and Corrective) and the third, which he calls simply τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς, *retaliatio*; the first two both rest with the public authority to administer, the third either with private persons or public authorities. I may add that I had adopted my theory about *Eth.* v. 5 before knowing of Pufendorf's remarks.

standard of merit, but in *παρεκβάσεις* like oligarchy and democracy will award power and honour according to wealth in the one case or on the principle of treating every freeman as equal in the other.

This Catallactic Justice is not a species of Particular Justice alongside of the other two. Whether it is to be called *πολιτικὸν δίκαιον* or not is a matter of words. It is *πολιτικὸν δίκαιον* certainly in the sense that it is the essential condition of the *πολιτικὴ κοινωνία* existing at all; but it cannot be called *πολιτικὸν δίκαιον* in the same full sense as those kinds of justice with which the *πολιτικός* as such concerns himself. Mr. J. Solomon (in the *Classical Review* vol. vii. p. 12) suggests that the contents of chap. 5 may relate to *τὸ οἰκονομικὸν δίκαιον*. But Aristotle expressly refers that term to the relation between husband and wife, the only one of the family relationships in which the conception of justice properly applies, i.e. justice or 'right' in the lawyer's sense not in the moralist's, if we may use a distinction that at once occurs to us, but was not yet clearly seen by Aristotle. The author of the *M. M.* applies the phrase 'household justice' to the relation between master and slave, saying that the relation between husband and wife comes nearer to political justice (1194b 20-24)—a variation from the terminology of *Eth. Nic.* v. 6 § 9, 1134 b 17, which may help to warn us against trusting too much to the *M. M.* as a clue to Aristotle's meaning. In the *Politics* (i. c. 8-11) *χρηματιστική* is treated as a branch of *οἰκονομική*, it is true, but not in that sense of *χρηματιστική* which means specially the art of exchange (*μεταβλητική*): so that this *δίκαιον* of *Eth. Nic.* v. c. 5, might rather have been called *μεταβλητικὸν* than *οἰκονομικόν*.

I do not think that *Eth. Nic.* v. 6 §§ 3, 4, 1134a 23-30 by itself would entitle one to assert that *τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός* belonged to *τὸ ἀπλῶς δίκαιον* as distinct from *τὸ πολιτικὸν δίκαιον*; but, taken in conjunction with the

arguments already used, the passage seems to confirm the view that *τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός* does not apply to a species of *τὸ πολιτικὸν δίκαιον*. The relation of Catallactic Justice to the two species of *Jus civile* may, I think, be best represented as follows:—

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE (Geometrical Proportion)	CORRECTIVE JUSTICE (Arithmetical Mean)
--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

both imply a *πῶλις*,
which implies
CATALLACTIC JUSTICE
(Proportionate Reciprocity).

The good case which seems to be made out by most interpreters of Aristotle, from the writer of the *Magna Moralia* to Mr. Stewart, for regarding the Justice of chap. 5 as dealing with the same matters as the Justice of chap. 4, or even as the Justice of chap. 3 also, would according to the theory I am suggesting be sufficiently explained by the fact that chap. 5 deals with the conception of Justice in a part of human social life which lies at the basis of the definite political organization that alone makes possible Corrective and Distributive Justice. My theory is identical with what I take to be that of Ramsauer in his note on *Eth. Nic.* v. 5 § 6, 1132b 31. But in working it out at greater length I have put it to a severer test: and I have also tried to explain the origin of the theories which I reject. If it be objected that I am reading into Aristotle ideas from later jurisprudence, I should answer that I have only followed out hints supplied by Aristotle himself (especially in *Pol.* iii. 9, a passage which professedly applies the conception of *τὸ δίκαιον* arrived at in the *Ethics*), and that I have not knowingly introduced anything inconsistent with what Aristotle clearly means.

D. G. RITCHIE.

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE REPUBLIC OF PLATO.

(Continued from p. 25.)

515 B. Εἰ οὖν διαλέγεσθαι οἱοί τ' εἶεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐκ αὐτὰ ἡγεῖ ἂν τὰ παρόντα αὐτοὺς νομίζειν [ὀνομάζειν] ἄπερ ὀρῶεν; So Baiter, adopting Madvig's οὐκ αὐτὰ and Ast's

παρόντα for the οὐ ταῦτα and παρόντα of MSS., and bracketing *ὀνομάζειν* with Cobet. Perhaps it would be better to read νομίζειν <καὶ> ὀνομάζειν. Cf. 443 E ἐν πᾶσι τοῦτοις

ἡγούμενον καὶ ὀνομάζοντα δικαίαν μὲν καὶ καλὴν πράξιν ἢ ἂν κ.τ.λ. The use of ἄπερ seems to me much in favour of ταῦτά, to which it is so often correlative.

515 D. εἰ τις αὐτῷ λέγοι ὅτι τότε μὲν ἑώρα φλυνάρις, νῦν δὲ μᾶλλον τι ἐγγυτέρω τοῦ ὄντος καὶ πρὸς μᾶλλον ὄντα τετραμμένος ὀρθότερα βλέπει, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν παριόντων δεικνύς αὐτῷ ἀναγκάζει ἐρωτῶν ἀποκρίνεσθαι ὅτι ἐστίν. Read ἐγγυτέρω <ὦν>, as in 330 E ὥσπερ ἤδη ἐγγυτέρω ὦν τῶν ἐκεῖ μᾶλλον τι καθορᾷ αὐτά. Baiter prints βλέπει, but Ast (3rd ed.) and Stallbaum are clearly right in reading βλέπει. The optative would not be grammatical, and Schneider, when he defends it by the ἀποθάνει in *Phaedo* 57 B, fails to notice that the optative there refers to past time. The right mood here is preserved in ὅτι ἐστίν. On the other hand in the words that follow, οὐκοῦν κἂν εἰ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ φῶς ἀναγκάζει αὐτὸν βλέπειν, (οὐκ οἶε αὐτὸν) ἀλγεῖν τε ἂν τὰ ὅμματα καὶ φεύγειν ἀποστρεφόμενον πρὸς ἐκεῖνα ἃ δύνανται καθορᾶν, is it certain that the indicative δύναται can stand? The optative seems to me necessary, just as in 516 E the ἀμβλυώτοι of a few MSS. seems preferable to Baiter's ἀμβλύνεται. So in 515 B ἄπερ ὀφείν could not be ἄπερ ὀρώσι. Cf. on 538 A below.

516 D. For ὅτι οὖν ἂν πεπονθέναι read ὅτι οὖν δὴ πεπονθέναι. See *Class. Rev.* vi. p. 341.

518 A. ἐπισκοποῖ ἂν, πότερον ἐκ φανότερου βίου ἦκουσα (ἢ ψυχῇ) ὑπὸ ἀληθείας ἐσκότωται ἢ ἐξ ἀμαθίας πλείονος εἰς φανότερον ἰούσα ὑπὸ λαμπροτέρου μαρμαρυγῆς ἐμπέληται. Should not ὑπὸ λαμπροτέρου be omitted? Just below (518 B) in τὴν παιδείαν οὐχ οἷαν τινὲς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι φασιν εἶναι τοιαύτην καὶ εἶναι the first εἶναι should be omitted. No good writer could have written the double εἶναι as it stands.

518 E. The other excellences of the soul are adventitious: ἢ δὲ τοῦ φρονήσαι παντός μᾶλλον θεοτέρου τινός ὡς εἴκοι τυγχάνει οὔσα, ὃ τὴν μὲν δύναμιν οὐδέποτε ἀπόλλυνσιν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς περιγωγῆς χρήσιμον καὶ ὠφέλιμον καὶ ἄχρηστον αὐ καὶ βλαβερὸν γίγνεται.

In a sentence containing a comparative adjective or adverb (here θεοτέρου) παντός μᾶλλον can have no place. Its proper use is illustrated by such passages as 520 E παντός μὲν μᾶλλον ὡς ἐπ' ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῶν ἕκαστος εἰσι τὸ ἄρχειν, or 595 A where it occurs twice. It is itself the comparative expression and cannot be combined (though μᾶλλον alone can) with another comparative. It was no doubt for this reason that Madvig got rid of παντός, suggesting πλῆσματος or ὑφάσματος μᾶλλον θεοτέρου.

I would rather suggest that παντός is a corruption of ὀργάνου (ΓΑΝτος of οργΑΝου). Not many lines above (518 C) we have τὴν ἐνοῦσαν ἕκαστον δύναμιν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τὸ ὄργανον ᾧ καταμανθάνει ἕκαστος.....περιακτέον εἶναι: cf. the περιαγωγή here. So (527 D) in the mathematical sciences ἕκαστον ὄργανον τι ψυχῆς ἐκκαθαίρεται τε καὶ ἀναζωπυρεῖται.....κρεῖττον ὃν σωθῆναι μυρίων ὀμμάτων. Cf. further 508 B τῶν περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ὀργάνων: 582 D ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ δι' οὗ γε δεῖ ὄργανον κρίνεσθαι, οὐ τοῦ φιλοκερδοῦς τοῦτο ὄργανον οὐδὲ τοῦ φιλοτίμου ἀλλὰ τοῦ φιλοσόφου: *Theaet.* 185 C, D. I read therefore ἢ δὲ τοῦ φρονήσαι ὄργανον μᾶλλον θεοτέρου κ.τ.λ. For μᾶλλον (not παντός μᾶλλον) added to a comparative see Ast's *Lexicon*, or Riddell's *Digest* § 166 c.

520 D. τὴν δ' ἐναντίους ἄρχοντας σχοῦσαν (πόλιν) ἐναντίως. As this refers to present time and is a rule of general application, we must read ἔχουσαν. The aorist participle would refer to the past, 'the state which got' or 'had got.'

529 C. κἂν ἐξ ὑπτίας νέων ἐν γῇ ἢ ἐν θαλάττῃ μανθάνῃ. Most MSS. seem to have νέων (with ναίων and νεῶν as variants), but A and one or two others have μὲν, while μὲν and μή are also found (Schneider). Pollux vii. 138 has νέιν δ' ἐξ ὑπτίας μάθημα κολυμβητῶν εἶρηκεν Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Πλάτων, which seems at first sight to show that he found νέων in his text, but perhaps this is not certain. Ἐξ ὑπτίας and ἐν θαλάττῃ would justify his citation. Madvig proposes to read ἢ (κἂν ἐξ ὑπτίας ἢ ἐν γῇ) and Baiter follows him. The conflicting readings of the MSS. might be to some extent reconciled if we were to read ἐξ ὑπτίας θεώμενος, a word which would be very much to the purpose here, as the long sentence began with κινδυνεύεις γὰρ εἰ τις ἐν ὁροφῇ ποικίλματα θεώμενος κ.τ.λ. and ἐξ ὑπτίας is certainly the better for going with a participle. I have also thought of κείμενος, and Ficinus actually has *iacens*.¹

Ibid. (δεῖ) ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ποικίλματα, ἐπεὶ περ ἐν ὁρατῷ πεποικιλταί, κάλλιπτα μὲν ἡγείσθαι καὶ ἀκριβέστατα τῶν τοιούτων ἔχειν, τῶν δὲ ἀληθινῶν πολλὴ ἐνδεῖν, ἅς τὸ ὄν τάχος καὶ ἡ οὔσα βραδυνὴ ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἀριθμῷ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀληθεῖσι σχήμασι φορέας τε πρὸς ἄλληλα φέρεται καὶ τὰ ἐνόντα φέρει ἃ δὴ λόγῳ μὲν καὶ διανοίᾳ ληπτὰ, ὅψει δ' οὐ.

¹ Mr. Marindin, who reminds me that Pollux may also be thinking of *Phaedrus* 264 A ἐξ ὑπτίας ἀνάπαλιν διανεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖ τὸν λόγον, suggests that Plato wrote here κἂν ἐξυπτιασμένος ἐν γῇ, and I incline to think his suggestion better than my own. Cf. Lucian's use of ἐξυπτιάσαν.

Defects of both grammar and sense condemn this sentence. With τῶν ἀληθινῶν we must of course understand ποικιλμάτων. These ποικίλματα are contrasted with the visible ποικίλματα of the sky, and to the former ἃ δὲ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ. refers. There is however no construction left in the sentence for ἄς...φορὰς...φέρεται κ.τ.λ. Moreover, as Ast pointed out, it is ridiculous to speak of swiftness and slowness as themselves moving or being carried along (φέρεται) and still more so to speak of them as carrying their contents (τὰ ἐνόντα) with them. What contents has swiftness? Evidently the subject of the verbs φέρεται and φέρει, as of ληπτὰ (ἐστίν), is τὰ ἀληθινὰ ποικίλματα. To obtain this sense, which is indispensable, Ast proposed to read ὦν τὸ ὦν τάχος καὶ ἡ οὐσα βραδυτής, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἀριθμῷ...φέρεται καὶ...φέρει, thus changing ἄς to ὦν and inserting καὶ before ἐν τῷ, 'of which absolute swiftness and slowness are the properties, and which move &c.' I believe this to be in essence right, and have only to suggest that instead of ὦν we might read οἷς, which is nearer to the ἄς of the MSS. Cf. 425 A, where I have suggested οἷς πρέπει for ἄς πρέπει, and 491 A, where ὀλίγοις is necessary for ὀλίγας. Whether we read καὶ ἐν or κἀν is immaterial.

529 E. ἡγήσατο γὰρ ἄν...κάλλιστα μὲν ἔχειν ἀπεργασίαι, γελοῖον μὲν ἐπισκοπεῖν ταῦτα σπουδῇ κ.τ.λ.

It looks as though an εἶναι were omitted before or after ἐπισκοπεῖν.

530 B. οὐκ ἄποιν ἡγήσεται τὸν νομίζοντα γίγνεσθαι τε ταῦτα αἰ ὥσαύτως καὶ οὐδαμῇ οὐδὲν παραλλάττειν, σῶμά τε ἔχοντα καὶ ὁρώμενα, καὶ ζητεῖν παντὶ τρόπῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτῶν λαβεῖν;

For ζητεῖν, which can hardly be right, Madvig suggests ζητήσῃ (which seems to me to give a wrong sense, for αὐτῶν must refer to ταῦτα) or ζητεῖν δεῖν (which gives an awkward number of infinitives). Read rather ζητοῦντα. Cf. note on 383 A.

530 C. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ τί ἔχεις ὑπομῆσαι τῶν προσηκόντων μαθημάτων;

The sense seems to require something like <ἄλλο> τι or <ἐτι> τι.

530 E. φυλάξομεν...μή ποτ' αὐτῶν τι ἀτελὲς ἐπιχειρώσιν ἡμῖν μαθάνειν οὓς θρέψομεν καὶ οὐκ ἐξήκον ἐκέισε αἰεὶ οἱ πάντα δεῖ ἀφίκειν.

Ἀφίκειν may be right, but the word seems hardly known and ἀνίκειν is much more usual in this sort of sense. Cf. below on 533 C. Perhaps of αἰεὶ rather than αἰεὶ οἱ.

531 A. τὰς γὰρ ἀκουόμενας αὐ συμφωνίας καὶ φθόγγους ἀλλήλοις ἀναμετροῦντες κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps <ἐν> ἀλλήλοις.

533 C. οὐκοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἡ διαλεκτικὴ μέθοδος μόνῃ ταύτῃ πορεύεται τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀναιρούσα ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἵνα βεβαιώσῃται, καὶ κ.τ.λ.

For ἀναιρούσα read certainly ἀνάγουσα, which had occurred to me before I found that Canter proposed it long ago. 'Ἀναιρούσα could only mean 'doing away with,' and 'doing away with (provisionally) in order to establish (again ultimately),' is a very unlikely meaning. 'Ἀναίρουσα of course suggests itself, but ἀναίρειν is unknown to Plato and extremely rare. Read therefore τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀνάγουσα ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχήν. We have ἀνάγειν again a couple of lines further on (ἔλκει καὶ ἀνάγει ἄνω), and for its use in connexion with ἀρχή cf. *Laurens* 626 D τὸν λόγον ἐπ' ἀρχὴν ὁρθῶς ἀναγαγῶν and many uses of the word in Aristotle. Not quite the same, but similar, seems its use above in 529 A ὡς μὲν νῦν αὐτὴν μεταχειρίζονται οἱ εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἀνάγοντες, where it certainly does not mean 'those who embark upon philosophy,' but makes an antithesis with the κάτω βλέπειν following.

533 E. An ordinary ἐπιστήμη (says Socrates) may perhaps be better called διάνοια. Ἐστὶ δ', ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, οὐ περὶ ὁνόματος ἀμφισβήτησις, οἷς τοσοῦτων περὶ σκέψης ὧσων ἡμῖν πρόκειται. Οὐ γὰρ οὖν, ἔφη ἄλλ' ὃ ἂν μόνον δηλοῖ πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ὧν σαφηνεία λέγεται ἐν ψυχῇ. (A has λέγεται written above λέγεται as an old correction.) Ἀρέσκει γοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, κ.τ.λ.

Baiter after Madvig writes λέγ', εἰ ἐν ψυχῇ and translates *sed quod modo declarat ad rem tenendam perspicuitate, dic, si intra animum tibi versatur*. See his *Adnotatio Critica* for some other suggested readings, only one of which I will quote here, because it is the only one which gives anything like a satisfactory sense. Bywater proposes ἄλλ' ὃ ἂν μόνον δηλοῖ τὴν ἐξ ὧν, πῶς ἔχει σαφηνείας ἡ λέγεις ἐν ψυχῇ, in which τὴν ἐξ ὧν and ἡ λέγεις do not seem to go very well together. I should rather suggest ὃ ἂν μόνον δηλοῖ πῶς αὐτὴν ἔχειν σαφηνείας λέγεις ἐν ψυχῇ, 'whatever will just show what degree of clearness in the mind you think it (the ἐπιστήμη or διάνοια, already referred to in the text three lines above as αὐτήν) possesses.' I also concur in the view that ἀρέσκει should probably be ἀρκέσει and be read twice over, for I cannot see how properly to construct ὃ ἂν κ.τ.λ. with οὐ περὶ ὁνόματος ἀμφισβήτησις. The passage will then run thus: ἄλλ' ὃ ἂν μόνον δηλοῖ πῶς αὐτὴν ἔχειν σαφηνείας λέγεις ἐν ψυχῇ ἀρκέσει. Ἀρκέσει (or perhaps we might here

keep 'Ἀρέσκει) γοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, κ.τ.λ. A possible alternative for πῶς αὐτὴν ἔχειν is πῶς ἔχειν τὴν ἔξιν, thus keeping the τὴν ἔξιν of the MSS. For the question with λέγεις, as I suppose it to be put, cf. 562 B 'Ἀρ' οὖν καὶ, ὃ δημοκρατία ὀρίζεται ἀγαθόν, ἢ τοῦτου ἀπληστία καὶ ταύτην καταλύει; Λέγεις δ' αὐτὴν τί ὀρίζεσθαι; Τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, εἶπον.

535 A. Τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τοῖνον, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἐκείνας τὰς φύσεις οἷον δεῖν ἐκλεκτέας εἶναι.

It is surprising that δεῖν has been so long allowed without protest to stand side by side with ἐκλεκτέας εἶναι. Unless it is a

corruption of something else, e.g. αἰεῖ, it must be removed altogether.

538 A. εἴ τις τραφεῖα κ.τ.λ., τοῦτον ἔχεις μαντεύσασθαι, πῶς ἂν διατεθείη... ἐν ἐκείνῳ τε τῷ χρόνῳ, ᾧ οὐκ ἦδει τὰ περὶ τῆς ὑποβολῆς, καὶ ἐν ᾧ αὖ ἦδει;

Can the imperfect indicative ἦδει stand in such a sentence? I think it should be εἰδείη, and we have that form in the parallel clause of the sentence following, ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ τὸ ἀληθές μὴ εἰδείη. Cf. note on 515 D.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

THE BEGINNING OF THE ATHENIAN HEGEMONY.

MR. J. E. SANDYS has kindly directed my attention to Kaibel's reasoning in support of the reading ἀκόντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, Arist. 'Αθ. Πολ. ch. 23, as confirming the view which he himself has expressed in his Aristotle's *Constitution*, p. 93. Kaibel's principal statement is as follows: 'Dass die Athener die Hegemonie zur See nicht ἐκόντων, sondern ἀκόντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων gewonnen oder genommen haben, ist doch wol allein historisch begründet' (*Stil und Text der Πολ. 'Αθ. d. Arist.* p. 178). I wish to prove, on the contrary, that if Aristotle wrote ἀκόντων, he is out of line with all the ancient writers who, so far as I have examined, have expressed with clearness their views of the event.

Isoc. *Paneg.* 72 does not prove anything,—οὐκ ἀμφισβητούντων may signify 'did not care to dispute' as well as 'did not dare to dispute.' There is nothing in the construction or in the meaning of ἀμφισβ. which would make Kaibel's translation preferable. This and the other passages cited from Isocrates (*de Pace* 30, *Panath.* 67, and *Areop.* 17; cf. Kaibel, *loc. cit.*) are absolutely neutral, and contribute nothing to the settlement of the question. Hdt. viii. 3 is also neutral,—ἀπειλοντο does not imply force or indicate that the Lacedaemonians were unwilling. We may infer from the passage that the Athenians assumed the hegemony without consulting the Lacedaemonians; but if any evidence should be adduced to prove that the Lacedaemonians yielded voluntarily, such evidence, it must be admitted, will not stand in contradiction to anything found in this chapter. Hdt. ix.

106 contains some important facts which bear upon the question at issue. The Peloponnesians, recognizing their inability to protect the cities of Ionia, proposed to transplant the Ionians into European Greece. The Athenians repudiated this proposition and declared that they alone had a right to take measures concerning their own colonies. Hereupon the Peloponnesians gladly yielded (*προθύμως ἔξαν*), and the Athenians thus took upon themselves the hegemony of the coast towns of Ionia together with the obligation of freeing and protecting these. The Lacedaemonians retained the hegemony of the islanders only. That the Lacedaemonians had little zeal for strengthening and extending or even maintaining their command at sea is shown by the fact that they returned home soon after this without accomplishing anything further, leaving the Athenians in full possession of the field of action (Hdt. ix. 114). We may reasonably regard this movement of the Lacedaemonians as a voluntary surrender to Athens of their remaining claims to the hegemony; and it is extremely doubtful whether they would have made any further claim to it, had it not been for the ambitious designs of Pausanias (cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Arist. und Athen*, i. p. 156). Accordingly, when they recalled him it seems that they not only left no commander in his place but even withdrew the Peloponnesian contingent from the fleet. Here again they show their lack of interest in maintaining their leadership. The sending of Dorcis with a few troops was but a half-hearted attempt to supply the con-

federates with a commander. When the latter found his post already occupied and had returned, 'the Lacedaemonians sent out no others afterwards because they feared that they might find those who went abroad becoming corrupted, just as they saw in the case of Pausanias, and because they desired at the same time to be rid of the Median war, and because finally they considered that the Athenians were competent to conduct the war and were on terms of friendship with them at that time' (Thuc. i. 95). Now if we should immediately add, as Kaibel seems to do, 'The Athenians having received the hegemony in this way with the consent of the allies, etc., but against the will of the Lacedaemonians,' we should contradict the passage from Thucydides just quoted. Thucydides, indeed (i. 75), represents the Athenians as saying to the Spartans, 'We received the hegemony because you were unwilling to remain in the field and finish the war with the barbarians,' and nowhere do we find this statement contradicted. Xenophon (*Hell.* vi. 34) represents a Spartan as declaring that the Athenians were chosen leaders τῶν Λακ. συμβουλευομένων. Unfortunately Sandys has classed this with those passages which do not show 'that the Lacedaemonians were really willing to surrender their supremacy,' while Kaibel calls it a Spartan tale. The willingness of the Lacedae-

monians is also shown by Plut. *Arist.* ch. 23 (quoted in my *Development of the Athenian Constitution*, p. 215, n. 3), while, in following the reading of Herwerden and Leeuwen, *de Rep. Ath.* p. 49 (εἰκόνην) I had in mind the προβήμους εἶξαν of Hdt. ix. 106.

The conditions involved in such a leadership were positively ruinous to Spartan state and society (cf. especially Bernhardt, *Griech. Lit.* i. p. 116). Ephorus (Diod. xi. 50) in representing dramatically the conflict of opinions in Sparta itself as to this event makes Hetoemaridas the spokesman of that party which understood and expressed in public life the true spirit of the Spartan constitution. As the interpreter of this spirit, Hetoemaridas persuaded the Spartans to the belief that in renouncing the hegemony in favour of Athens they were removing from themselves an obligation both dangerous and burdensome, and were at the same time bating no point of their rights (Curtius, *History of Greece*, ii. p. 374 f., N.Y. 1886). Among the modern authorities who hold the view maintained in this paper are Grote (*History of Greece*, v. p. 258 ff., Harper's ed.), Curtius (*loc. cit.*), Cox (*Greek Statesmen*, first series, p. 208), Holm (*Griech. Gesch.* ii. p. 115), Thumser (*die griech. Staatsalterthümer*, p. 220), and Busolt (*Müller's Hdb.* iv.² p. 321).

GEORGE W. BOTSFORD.

H. STEPHENS'S *VETUSTISSIMA EXEMPLARIA*.

'In literary history,' says Mark Pattison, 'a conjecture passes into a certainty by repetition' (*Essays* i. p. 120). There is a 'conjecture' about Henry Stephens, which has apparently lost sight of its original source, and is now passing through the 'repetition' stage. 'That learned man,' as Porson calls him (*Tracts*, p. 92), before he began his long career of editing and authorship, travelled for about two years (1547-1549) in Italy, visiting, as he tells us (*Annot. in Soph. et Eurip.* p. 98), all the public and the best of the private libraries in that country. Among the rich harvest of texts and notes which he brought back from this journey were, he says, readings from two very old MSS. containing the eight plays of Euripides which form the second volume of the Aldine edition (*Rhesus, Troades, Bacchae, Cyclops, Heraclidae, Helena, Ion* and *Hercules*

Furens). Wherever these MSS. differed from the Aldine edition, he noted the fact, and published these readings (twenty years afterwards), along with conjectures of his own, in such a way that it is nearly always possible to distinguish the readings from the conjectures.

That a man, who in the course of forty-four years edited or wrote (as well as printed and published) more than 170 books, should have made some mistakes, and sometimes written 'like one asleep,' will not surprise any one who has had experience of printing and editing. But apparently the case is far more shocking than that. This is what we are now taught by the two scholars to whom, after Elmsley, we in England owe most of our power of understanding and appreciating the finest of Euripides' plays. 'It is now fully established,' says

Prof. Tyrrell (*Bacchae*, ed. 1892, p. 126), 'that he [Stephens] was in the habit of recommending his own conjectures by the authority of pretended MSS. (vid. Kirch. Praef.)' and in the preface, p. xix., he says 'Kirchhoff has shown that they [the vett. codd.] were feigned to give authority to his own conjectures.' Dr. Sandys, again (*Bacchae*,³ p. 213), talks of H. Stephens' 'fraudulent statement' about his 'pretended Italian MSS.'

Supposing it should turn out that neither in any 'preface' nor anywhere else had Kirchhoff touched the subject of Stephens's Italian MSS., and some indignant defender of the memory of the author of the *Thesaurus* were to call Prof. Tyrrell—but it is too horrible to contemplate. I, at all events, can find no reference to the question in any of Kirchhoff's writings. Brunck (on *Bacchae*, v. 235) speaks of H. Stephens's *sublesta fides* as the only support for a reading, asking why he had not said *where* he saw the MSS. Elmsley, in the preface to his *Bacchae*, comments somewhat significantly on the fact that no one else had seen these MSS., and Hermann (pref. to Eur. *Helena*, p. v.) says that people who believe in Stephens's two old Italian MSS. are *nimis creduli*. At the most, he says, the readings were marginal notes, perhaps Stephens's own.

Is it not a reason for being 'credulus' when we find that in twenty-three passages in the *Troades* Stephens quotes from his '*vetustissima exemplaria*' variants which turn out to be the readings of the better class of

MSS. of which *Vat.* 909 (Prinz's *B*, Kirchhoff's *B*) is the best representative? The published editions of the *Troades* in Stephens's time, and for about 200 years afterwards, were based on *Pal.* 287 (Prinz's *P*, Kirchhoff's *B*). In two passages in the *Troades* (vv. 193-196, and vv. 232-234) *P* and *Ald.* omit half lines to the extent of thirteen words, which words occur in *Vat.* 909, and are recorded almost exactly by Stephens as noted by him in his old MSS. If he did *not* find these words there, where did he find them?¹

Isaac Voss (of whom Charles II. said that he was a sort of *savant* who would believe anything provided it was not in the Bible) said he had found certain readings in a Florentine MS. of Euripides. Nobody has seen or identified the MS. but nobody doubts the genuineness of the readings. And yet one of the most learned Greek scholars and one of the greatest benefactors of classical scholarship that ever lived, is in the nineteenth century called *mendacissimus* (Prof. Tyrrell, *Bacchae* ed. 1871, p. 60) for having made a similar statement. Surely this question ought not to be regarded as settled without a much more searching discussion than it has yet received.

E. B. ENGLAND.

¹ In nearly but not quite all these twenty-three cases P. Vettori, in his marginal notes to the Aldine ed. preserved in the Munich Library, gives the same reading as H. S. Stephens made Vettori's acquaintance on his Italian journey: perhaps some one will say that he got his readings from Vettori, but I hardly think it is likely.

VARIA.

ON SOPHOCLES, *Tr.* 1260, 1261.

χάλυβος
λιθοκόλλητον στόμιον παρέχουσ'.

That λιθοκόλλητος is a perfectly good word, and means 'set with stones' is attested by plenty of passages (e.g. Chares *ap.* Athen. 514 F, Aristobulus *ap.* Strabo 730, Menander *ap.* Poll. 10, 187, &c.). From Lucian (i. p. 29: καὶ ὁ χαλινὸς ἦν λιθοκόλλητος, Δαρείου τινὸς ἢ Καμβύσου ἢ Κίρον αὐτοῦ κειμήλιον) it is plain that stones were used at least in the ornamentation of the bridle very early. Professor Jebb in the appendix to his edition of the *Trachiniae*

(on v. 1261) says that a curb of steel, set with pieces of stone, has not been supported by any proof that a steel curb was ever furnished with teeth of stone; and further, that the epithet, if referring to ornamentation of the bridle, would be wholly out of place here. This latter we grant: but there is evidence from ancient writers that the bit was set with stones. One of the scholiasts on Sophocles, who probably wrote before 30 B.C., recognizes the word and explains it by λίθινον καὶ σκληρὸν χαλινόν. More conclusive evidence is to be found about 400 years later in the poet Claudian (70, 7):

sanguineo virides morsu vexare smaragdos;

Cf. *id.* 8, 549, 550 :

turbantur phalerae : spumosis morsibus aurum
fumat : anhelantes exundant sanguine gemmae ;

and, again, 73, 7, 8 :

accipe regales cultus, et crine superbus
erecto virides spumis perfunde smaragdus.

These jewels were set doubtless near the ends of the bit, and were ornamental as well as severe. Cf. *Isid. Orig.* 4, 8 : frenusculi ulcera circa rictum oris : similia his quae fiunt iumentis asperitate frenorum. But at the outset probably nothing but sharp or jagged pieces of stone were used, which would make a very cruel bit. It is likely therefore that this sort of a bit is meant in the *Trachiniae*. (The passage from Nonnus quoted by Prof. Jebb, p. 206, I cannot find, but εἰλάγγας occurs in Nonnus 11, 122, and 32, 242, ed. Koechly, 1857. Compare Claud. 70, 3 : gemmis dum frena reudent, &c.)

ON TIBULL. I. 1, 2.

et teneat culti iugera magna soli.

Shall we read *magna* or *multa*? *Magna* is supported by G (Baehrens) and by the Paris and Freising excerpts, and has therefore the weight of authority. *Multa* is found in A V g (Baehrens). Editors agree, I think, in reading *multa*, and for the same reason perhaps that Prof. Ramsay urges, that the iugerum is a fixed amount! To say that a similar mistake occurs in Ovid, *Amor.* 3, 15, 12, is begging the question. In this passage, Palatinus primus with two other MSS. reads *iugera parva*. Most editors (if not all except Müller in his *Carm. Amat.* 1861) accept *paucā*.

Light is thrown on both these passages by Statius (*Th.* 5, 550) :

collectus gyro spatiosaque iugera complet.

Our acres, too, are all of the same size, but we say, rhetorically, 'broad acres.' Why should not the Romans do likewise? *Magna* (and *parva* too) is the lectio difficilior, and therefore the more probable reading.

F. K. BALL.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

THE WORD ANΑΣΑΚΕΤ.

THE inscription on a bronze helmet (no. 247 in Zvetaieff's *Inscrip. Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae*, *Rhein. Mus.* xxxix. p. 558, *Mém. de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris* vi. p. 51) has caused great difficulty to scholars. BÜCHELER reads Σαίπυς ἀνα ἀκετ Σπείδης Μάμερεκιες, and translates 'Saepina praeda; egit Spedius Mamercius' 'Saepine spoil—Spedius Mamercius won it.' He denies that the Σ after *ana* is a letter. BRÉAL reads Σπείδης Μάμερεκιες Σαίπυς ἀνασάκετ, and translates 'Spedius Mamercius Saepinas consecravit' 'Spedius Mamercius of Saepinum made this offering.' W. DEECKE in his appendix to Zvetaieff says: 'Die Inschrift im Rhein. Mus. xxxix. 558 ist zu lesen—spedis : mamerekies : | saipins : ana aket, d.i. Spedius Mamercius Saepinus dedicavit. ana is Preposition, ākēt Perfect from akum = agere.'

Prof. Conway (*Trans. of the Camb. Phil. Soc.* vol. iii. part iv. p. 222 *sqq.*), in discussing 'Veseris and the letter F,' mentions a set of Oscan coins with the legend *ʒevserp* and *fensernum* which Dr. Imhoof-Blumer (*Numismat. Zeits.* 886, p. 206 ff.)

assigns to the town Veseris. The object of his paper is to discuss the 'altogether exceptional representation of the same sound by v in Latin and f in Oscan.' Dr. Blumer had been unable to give parallel uses of the sign ʒ. But Prof. Conway quotes our inscription and also the one immediately preceding it in Zvetaieff as containing the same letter reversed,¹ adding that in these two inscriptions σ is the ordinary Ionic ʒ. The latter inscription is Τρεβης Σ. Σερτες δεδερ (sic Zvetaieff) where Conway explains it festes = Festus. In the former he explains ΤΕΥΛΑΨΑΝΑ, as -facker in composition = Osc. *fefaced (fefacust) Umbr. *faced (facust). He compares Umbr. Klavlaf a a n f e h t a f Tab. Ig. ii. a. 33, which he says may possibly mean 'the dedicated chine.' Apparently therefore, though he does not translate the inscription, he wishes to get the same meaning as I do.

Σεrτες in the inscription above quoted

¹ A view to which he still adheres in *Class. Rev.* vol. vii. pp. 468, 469.

is generally understood as 'Sestius' or 'Sextius'; but against this it may be said that the suffix *-ios is generally represented in Oscan inscriptions by -is -iis -ies (in the Latin alphabet) and by -is -ies -iys (in the Greek alphabet). Hence it is much better to suppose Σεσρες is for 'Sestus' or 'Sextus' which we not unfrequently find in Latin inscriptions as a cognomen as well as a praenomen, e.g. L. Tertinius Sextus (*C.I.A.* 1948 and 2021), Lic. Sextus (*C.I.A.* 2500), Sex. Vireius Sextus (where it is both praenomen and cognomen): for the st = x cf. Umbr. sestentasiaru = 'sextantiarum.'

The word preceding Σεσρες (whose first letter is written Ϝ) is ΤΡΕΒΣΣ. Bücheler *Rhein. Mus.* xxxix. p. 559 says the second Σ is a sign of separation both here and in *avaaraket*, but this is extremely unlikely. The probability is that the first Σ is an error on the part of the engraver for Ε (Zvetaieff gives Τρεβς with an ι), and possibly the engraver was led to write Ϝ for Σ at the beginning of the second word to avoid the ambiguity which would be caused by the close proximity of so many Σ's and Ε's in ΤΡΕΒΣΣΣΣΕΣΤΕΣ. In this inscription Conway's explanation by 'Festus' does not seem necessary, for Festus has not the advantage of being so common a name as Sextus; nor is it likely, for, if Ϝ is for ζ retrograde (= Ϸ), as Conway suggests, it is strange that it is so imperfectly formed, considering how very clearly ζ is cut in this inscription each time it occurs. Nor can I agree with his explanation of ΤΕΥΑϜΑΝΑ. It is true that in Latin *facere* is often used with the meaning 'sacrifice' (cf. Greek *πέζω*); but, in so far as I am aware, this only applies to *facio* uncompounded; *facio* in composition does not, I think, possess this meaning. Whether we regard *aanfēhtaf* (quoted above) with Bücheler as = Lat. 'infectas' (≠ 'raw or half-raw chine'! Conway), or with Conway as from the preposition *an-*, it does not seem possible to extract the meaning 'dedicated' from it. In Greek, *ἀναθεῖναι* gets its meaning 'dedicate' as an outcome of its literal meaning 'placed up, offered up on the God's altar,' but in Italic the Idg. √dhē- had lost its meaning 'to place' and had only retained that of 'to make.' We frequently find, it is true, on old, especially sepulchral, Latin inscriptions the letter F or FC = 'fecit,' 'faciendum curavit'—but there it only means 'A. made or constructed

(not 'dedicated') this tomb.' We do not find it used in inscriptions with the meaning 'dedicate an offering.' To express this latter meaning we find instead, e.g. *do, porto* (*C.I.L.* 191), *voveo, dico* (*C.I.L.* 807) *dedico* (*C.I.L.* 541), &c. In short the meaning 'to dedicate' is not found in any form of the √dhē- in Latin inscriptional writing, nor do the writers use *facio* in composition with this meaning.

Hence, as it is hardly likely that in our inscription the verb can have any other meaning than 'dedicated,' and as it is improbable that *facio*, either compounded or uncompounded, can have that meaning, and as moreover the 'graphic' argument given above on Σεσρες holds good for *avaaraket* also, we must endeavour to find some other explanation. Buck (*Der Vocalismus der Oskische Sprache*) discusses the word *avaaraket* on pp. 14, 15, 17. On p. 14 he classes it with *angetuzet* 'proposuerint, insserint' Lat. *an-helō*, Umbr. *an-tentu* 'intendito' &c. Gk. Att. *ἀνά* Boeot. Arcad. *ἀν*. Below he adds 'Auffallend ist das scheinbar nicht-apokopierte *ana* in *avaaraket*, falls es richtig interpretiert worden ist. Dürfen wir vielleicht an griech. Einfluss denken?' Below again, p. 17, he refers *avaaraket* to a verbal ā-stem *sakā (cf. *sakahīter* = *sanciat*). He agrees with Jules Marthia (Bréal, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. p. 5) that Bücheler (*Rhein. Mus.* 39, 558 f.) is wrong to doubt that Ϝ is a genuine letter, and adds that a not-impossible explanation for Ϝ (whereas elsewhere in the inscription we have ζ) = σ is that given by Louis Duvau *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. p. 227. Brugmann, *Grundriss* ii. § 867, 5, p. 1235 (1892 A.D.) classes *avaaraket* under thematic aorists of his class ii. saying 'Osk. *ana-saked* oder *ana-zaked* "consecravit" (Bréal and Duvau) zu Lat. *sanciō*.' I venture to think that Buck is on the right track, when he says 'Dürfen wir vielleicht an griech. Einfluss denken?' In spite of the many difficulties to be surmounted, I would venture to suggest that *avaaraket* was a borrowed word, and represents the Greek word *ἀνέθηκε*, so common in Greek votive inscriptions, with the meaning 'dedicated an offering.' The meaning would thus be much the same as Bréal's 'consecravit,' but it is reached by a different way. That it should be a borrowed word need not surprise us; there are others, borrowed both from Greek and Latin; the latter need not concern us here; from the former Buck (*ib.* p. 10) quotes: *Evklúí: Eúkleís,*

Herukinaí: Ἑρκίνη, Kúíniks: χοῖνιξ, Λαπωνίς: Λαμπώνιος, ποτερεμ: ποτήρ, Santia: Ξανθίας, and some others.

The south of Italy was studded with Greek colonies, chiefly Achaean and Dorian, and the non-Greeks in Southern Italy were constantly coming into contact with Greek life, manners, and language—a contact which was furthered by the importance of the city of Tarentum to Greeks and non-Greeks alike. Accordingly we may expect not only to find Achaean and Doric characteristics in the language of the Greek colonies themselves, but also to find it reflected even in the dialects of the non-Greek peoples in this part of Italy. Perhaps of all inscriptions those commemorating votive offerings are the most common, and of all the words which occur on these inscriptions *ἀνέθηκε* is probably the most frequent. May it not then be possible, or even probable that the non-Greek inhabitants in Southern Italy may have borrowed the word *ἀνέθηκε* from the Greek inhabitants, in the sense of ‘dedicating’ an offering?

Let us now examine *ανασακετ* and see how it can have come from *ἀνέθηκε*. That *θ* was changed to *σ* by the Laconians is a fact noticed by grammarians of all ages: e.g. Apoll. *de Synt.* p. 39, 3, οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι Δωριεῖς τηροῦσι τὸ θ, Λάκωνες δὲ καὶ εἰς σ μεταβάλλουσιν, and it is hardly necessary to multiply examples, such as Thuc. v. 77, where in the Laconian decree τῷ σέῳ σύματος = τοῦ θεοῦ θύματος; but one other from Aleman 72 [24] (Bergk) has particular application here: ‘Ὀρας δ’ ἔσθηκε τρεῖς,’ ‘and he made three seasons,’ where B has ἔσακε τρεῖς, for in this passage we not only have the actual word which we are seeking (cf. Aristoph. *Lys.* 1080, 1081), but we also find it spelt with *α* for *η*. Inscription 33 in Cauer (*Delect. Inscr. Graec.*), found at Taenarum, furnishes us with some good instances: Σηρανδρίδα (line 2) for Θηρανδρίδα, Σήριππος (line 23) for Θήριππος, Σίπομπος (line 24) for Θεόπομπος, probably coming through the form *θω-* for *θεο-*, Σικλῆς (line 27) for Θεοκλῆς, and Ἀλκισοίδας (line 38) for Ἀλκιθοίδας (which is remarkable for the change of *θ* to *σ* before *ο*), τὸν σὶν φέρων (line 51) i.e. τὸν θιὸν φέρων (‘idem in titulo simili Foucart apud Le Bas, *Voy. arch.* ii. n. 163 d. vocatur σιοφόρος,’ Cauer). This change seems to have been peculiar to the Laconians, and not to have been common to the other Dorians; the traces of it in Crete are ‘suspectissima’ Ahrens (*de Dial. Dor.* § 7, p. 69). (Compare also Müllen-

siefen *de Titulorum Laconicorum Dialecto*, § 8, who cites the form *ἀνέσθηκε* (= *ἀνέθηκε*) from an archaizing inscription of the second century A.D.). We see thus that this change was comparatively late on inscriptions—and it may be said by objectors that where we find the change in the MSS. of Aleman, Aristophanes, &c., it is probably due to archaizing grammarians—but this view seems hardly likely in the face of all the evidence: it is much more probable that even at Aleman’s early date *θ* was pronounced *σ*, though perhaps at that time it was written *θ*, and hence the change was made to *σ* later in writing also to represent the sound which *θ* had had in Laconia in Aleman’s time. And it is thus also very probable that Aristophanes, finding that the Laconians did not pronounce *θ* exactly as the Athenians did, exaggerated the difference and deliberately turned *θ* into *σ*. Or it may be that *θ* was pronounced *þ* (English *th*) and that *σ* was an attempt to represent this spirant value. It is true that we do not find this change of *θ* to *σ* in the Tables of Heraclea, nevertheless when once it had arisen in Laconia itself, it may well have come over thence into the Laconian colonies in Southern Italy. Again, if the theory be correct that *θ* was pronounced in Laconia sufficiently like *σ* to induce Aristophanes to write *σ* for *θ*, it is quite possible that, though *θ* was written in the Tables of Heraclea, it may have been pronounced *σ* (or a sound approaching *σ*) so that the neighbouring non-Greeks would have understood and adopted it as such.

Another suggestion is perhaps possible, though perhaps hardly likely. The Oscan inscription under notice is retrograde; hence the *§* (if it be an *Ϝ*) should be reversed, thus *ⱥ*. Perhaps therefore, after all, the letter may turn out to be, not *Ϝ*, but *θ*, rather imperfectly formed. This and the one letter in the lower line, it will be noticed, are the only two letters on the inscription which are not perfectly intelligible at first sight. They are the only two letters which are not formed by merely straight lines—they require a curved formation, hence possibly the unsatisfactory engraving in their case. At the same time, that the *Ϝ* should be written in a different direction to the rest of the inscription would be no real difficulty. Fabretti (*Paleog. Studien* § 104, p. 82) says that there is no Greek letter which takes a different direction to the rest of the inscription so often as *ζ* and *ς*. *ς* is the form that ought strictly to be

written, where the inscription runs from left to right, ζ where it runs from right to left. He cites many instances of wrong direction (quoting mostly from F. Lenormant *Rhein. Mus.* 1867, vol. xxii. pp. 279 ff.); among them *C.I.G.* 28.

Next, *ā* for *η*. I do not know of any instance of the word *ἀνέθηκε* itself spelt with *a* instead of *η* (i.e. **ἀέθακε*) on Laconian inscriptions, either in Greece or in Italy. (We find however *ἔσακε* = *ἔθηκε* as a *v.l.* in Aleman (*v. supra*), which is worth mentioning, although perhaps we may not attach much importance to it.) One way of explaining this difficulty is to suppose that the long *ā* in the word under discussion (*avaσake*) is a hyper-Dorism; Doric is noted for its retention of original *a* where Attic preferred *η* or *ε* (as *μάτηρ*, *ἀλλοκα*). Hence long *ā* might have come in by false analogy here. Or again, as it is in a votive inscription, the *a* may possibly have come in from wrongly assumed connexion with *sakrim* 'sacrum,' *saka-hiter* 'sanciat,' &c. (Compare the example cited by Prof. Kirkland in *Class. Rev.* vi. p. 435, of *sarcophagus* becoming in vulgar idiom *sacrophagus*, through the influence of *sacer*.)

For instances of hyper-Dorism we have only to look at the Elean inscriptions, where they abound. Thus the Elean inscriptions

show *ā* often, where even Doric has *η*—for example *παρά*: Doric *παρί* &c. (cf. Carolus Daniel *De Dialecto Eliaco*, § 3, p. 17). Those who went to the Olympian festival might well carry away with them a taint of this characteristic of the Elean dialect. The *τ* is no real difficulty, because Oscan in the Greek alphabet regularly writes *-τ* in secondary tenses, while in the native alphabet it has *-d* (Conway *A.J.P.* xi. 309 f.). The alteration of the *ε* (augment) to *a* may perhaps have arisen in a short syllable from ignorance on the part of those who borrowed the word.

I would add as a possible parallel to *avaσake* (in case my explanation be right) the Phrygian *addake* *ada* *ake* (*v. Brugmann Gr. ii.* § 864, p. 1232) which is referred generally to *θηκ*, Lat. *fēc-i* from *√dhē*, just as I would refer *avaσake* also back to *ἀνέθηκε*, there being however this difference, that the Phrygian forms are not necessarily supposed to be borrowed, while I believe *avaσake* is so.

I confess that this explanation of *avaσake* may seem at first sight improbable, and has certainly many difficulties in the way of its reception, but as the word does not seem to have been, as yet, satisfactorily explained, it may be worth while to put forward the conjecture.

L. HORTON-SMITH.

CICERO, *EPIST. AD FAM.* XI. 13.

It may be worth noting in connexion with Lord Harborton's interesting article in the February number of this *Review* that Gurlitt in *Fleck. Ann.* 1880, p. 611, called attention to the fact that *Cic. ad fam.* xi. 13 was made up of fragments of two different letters, and Mendelssohn in his lately-published edition of the *Epist. ad fam.* has accepted Gurlitt's conclusions. Koerner

and Schmidt in fact in their appendix to the same work express the belief that the two fragments formed parts of letters addressed respectively by D. Brutus to Cicero and by Plancus and D. Brutus to the Senate and People of Rome.

F. F. ABBOTT.

The University of Chicago.

TACITUS, *GERM.* c. 29.

MANET honos et antiquae societatis insigne; nam nec tributis contemnuntur nec publicanus atterit.

In this passage *contemnuntur* is commonly translated 'humiliated'; but no other example of this usage of *contemnere* is given in the standard editions. Should we not

read *contaminantur*, 'are polluted,' 'degraded'? The change is an easy one, and *contaminantur* would correspond well to *atterit* in the next clause, both words having an underlying physical sense.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.

CATULL. XXIX. 20.

AMONG the new readings of Catullus suggested by Mr. S. G. Owen in his recent beautiful edition of that author, there is one which has been several times picked out for commendation by reviews. The passage is xxix. 20, where Mr. Owen gives *Eumne Gallia et timet Britannia*. But a

reference to the third volume of the *Classical Review*, p. 292, will show that so long ago as 1889 Dr. William Everett suggested and defended there the same reading of the line.

M. H. M.

XENOPHON'S HELLENICA.

i. 7 (25). καὶ οὐκ ἀδικοῦντες ἀπολοῦνται.

PROF. MARRATT, following Büchschütz in his note on this passage, translates *they will not, while not guilty, be put to death*, and adds 'but the connexion of the partic. and verb is hardly such as to warrant the single negative.' These words seem to have occasioned some perplexity; for, as Prof. Marratt remarks, Sauppe and Kurz omit ἀδικοῦντες and Breitenbach brackets it. All difficulty is removed by supplying ὥς before ἀδικοῦντες, and the words οἱ δ' ἀναίτιοι.....ἀπολοῦνται may then be rendered, *but the guiltless will be acquitted by you and not be put to death as criminals*.

ii. 3 (31). ἀποβλέπει δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

The same editor, in a note on this

passage, says 'In the connexion the words should mean: *faces both ways*.' But why? In the preceding clause the buskin is said to fit both feet, but surely not both at once. There ἀμφοτέρους = ἐκατέρους, and why not take the gen. as used for a similar equivalent? Theramenes is likened to a buskin, because he is capable of adapting himself to either party, but proving false to either when identified with the other. If the parallelism be complete, ἀποβλέπει refers to the appearance of the buskin in the act of toeing out, the normal position of the feet in standing, in which case it would of course 'look away' from the other foot.

W. J. SEELYE.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES' HELENA.

184-190. ὄμαδον ἔκλυον is impossible: ὄμαδος occurs nowhere else in Tragedy and is inappropriate to the cry of one woman. The words have probably displaced a substantive and its epithet balancing the phrase ἄλυσον ἔλεγον: the words ὅ,τι ποτ' ἔλακεν seem to show that there should be two alternative descriptions of the noise heard.

29. τίν' ὑπολείπομαι τύχη;

The correction τύχην seems inevitable, but Paley's translation of it ('relictam habeo') will not stand. Translate—'What fortune do I not experience?' ὑπολείπει τί με would mean 'something is wanting to me' and ὑπολείπομαι τι would have the same meaning. The construction (not noticed by L. and S.) is analogous to that of ἀποστεροῦμαι. That

this is the sense is shown by the fact that the speaker then goes on to *enumerate* her experiences.

388-9. It is unnecessary to suppose a loss of words. *πισθείς* for *πεισθείς* (which is however a correction and not supported, as formerly supposed, by MS. authority) is tolerable but unnecessary: *πεισθείς* is the antithesis of *ἐκόν*: perhaps it is an unintelligent gloss on *ἄκόν*. *ἔρανον* 'contribution' is ironical as applied to Pelops' contribution of his own body: the word is used of this particular feast in Pindar *Ol.* i. 61, which Euripides may have remembered (see Fennell's note).

578. Perhaps

σκέψαι τί σ' οὐ δεῖ; τί δ' ἐτι σοι σαφέστερον;

601. Keep *θαύμαστ'* and *ἔχων*, translating 'Ay in wondrous wise, experiencing the name not so much as the thing.'

A very Euripidean reply: viz. 'I have been robbed of my charge (the supposed Helen) but it was a robbery without robbers: she is really gone, though no one stole her.'

The change of number from *σπλάσθε* to *ἔχων* is of course common enough.

810. ? *σιδηρότρων* (see L. and S.).

1535. MS. *εἰς ἐν ἡν*. Paley *ἐνετέθη*. ? *εἰσένει* (from *εἰσένειω*, 'heaped in'). *εἰσένειω* seems a possible word.

ARTHUR F. HORT.

AMPHITRUO I. 1, 26-30.

In the February number of the *Classical Review*, 1893, Dr. Knapp criticized Prof. Palmer's rendering of *numero* 'too soon' in the above passage of the *Amphitruo*, on the ground that a contradiction is thus occasioned owing to the thirtieth line. Dr. Knapp has evidently misinterpreted Plautus and Prof. Palmer as well—*quoniam bene quae in me fecerant ingrata ea habui atque irrita* does not refer to any neglect in giving thanks, but, as Prof. Palmer puts it, to showing forgetfulness and ingratitude, by starting on a perilous errand to the house of *Amphitruo* after he had received such marked protection when in peril from war and on the sea. Such an interpretation gives *ingrata habui atque irrita* its proper force. *Sosia* feels that he deserves to be left to the mercies of some foot-pad, or, as he declares more strongly, the gods would act justly were they to cause some one to chastise him for his foolhardiness. In this sense *Sosia* is a *verna verbero*.

As to *numero* it should be noticed that 'soon,' 'too soon,' 'so soon' alone interpret the five other uses of this word in Plautus.

Note also from *Festus*, p. 170 (M),—*Panurgus Antonius haec ait: numero nimium cito, celeriter nimium....celeriter. Caecilius in Aethione....ei perii: quod ita numero venit? fuge domum. Afranius in Suspecta: perfalsum et abs te creditum numero nimis, celeriter. Afranius in Simulante, (emisera) me miserum! numero ac nequiquam egi gratias.*

Nonius 352, 19,—*Numero significat cito. Turpilius Demetrio—numquam nimis numero quemquam vidi facere quam facto est opus. 352, 21,—Turpilius Demetrio...ego interim in turba foras subdixi cum hac me, neque sat numero mihi videbar currere. 352, 25,—Afranius Privigno...numero inepti pertimistis cassam terriculum adversari.*

JAMES C. EGBERT JR.

Columbia College.

NOTES ON VIRGIL, AENEID 2, 353 AND EUR. BACCHAE 506.

Moriamur, et in media arma ruamus: una salus victis nullam sperare salutem.

Aen. 2. 353.

'Hysteron-proteron is when, of two things, that which naturally comes first is mentioned last: as *moriamur.....*' *Pub. Sch. Lat. Gr.* § 215, and so too generally the commentators, in whose notes on Virgil this phrase 'Hysteron-proteron' occurs repeatedly. Is it not time that such rubbish was definitely excluded from notes and grammars? How long are we going on accusing Virgil of mentioning that last 'which naturally comes first'? Putting the cart before the horse is folly, even when

disguised under one of those Greek phrases which are so often employed—in grammar, in medicine, and in theology—to cloak ignorance. No writer of sense puts that last which should come first, and to accuse a great writer of doing so is mere impertinence.

The simple fact is that the poets, and Virgil in particular, continually append to the main clause, which naturally comes first, an explanatory clause introduced by *que* (or sometimes *et*), and this clause, which is logically subordinate to the main clause and naturally follows it, often refers to something which is prior in point of time to that which the main clause describes; but

this priority in point of time does not make the clause one whit less subordinate or give it any right to priority in point of sense. The origin of such explanatory clauses is to be found in the natural tendency of poets to prefer a simple style of writing with co-ordinate clauses rather than a complex style with subordinate ones, or, in grammatical jargon, to choose Parataxis rather than Hypotaxis, the metrical convenience of clauses introduced by *que* and *et* of course also encouraging the practice.

Take a few instances from the *Aeneid*: 2. 208 *pontum...legit sinuatque* 'skims the sea by twisting'; 2. 223 *fugit et...eccussit securim* 'has escaped...after dashing away the axe'; 4. 154 *agmina...fuga glomerant montesque relinquunt* 'as they quit the hills'; 4. 263 *fecerat...et disceverat* 'had made (the cloak) by embroidering...'; 6. 361 *invasisset praedamque...putasset* 'had attacked me thinking'; 6. 365 *terram inice...portusque require Velinos* 'bury me making for the harbour of V.'; Eur. *Hec.* 266 *κείνη γὰρ ὤλεσέν νιν ἐς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει* 'destroyed him by bringing him.'

Applying this principle to the present passage we get 'Let us die by dashing into the thickest of the fray,' and obviously the passionate *moriatur* must not be taken too literally but is really = 'let us dare death,' for, as the next line shows, the speaker does not urge them to die but to dare to die, because the only way to avoid death is to court it. The Hysteron-proteron critics, who argue you that you must 'rush' before you 'die' and cannot do so after, in their painful desire for accuracy make the words *una salus victis nullam sperare salutem* absolute nonsense.

In 6. 567 *castigatque auditque dolos subigitque fateri* the real Hysteron-proteron has escaped the blind idolatry of its devotees. It is not *auditque* but *subigitque* which ought to be worshipped. The inquisitor 'scourges' his victims and then 'hears their guile compelling them to confess (i.e. by scourging them).'¹

In 3. 662 *postquam allos tetigit fluctus et ad aequora venit* Conington says '*ad aequora venit* must be taken as a ὑστερον πρότερον.' Why? The Cyclops, whose stature is immense, wades to the deep waves and reaches the level open sea (*aequora*) before he begins to bathe his wound. It takes him some time to get out of his depth. Virgil has endeavoured to suggest this, and is in consequence credited with writing nonsense.

ΔΙ. οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς οὐδ' ὁρᾷς οὐθ' ὄστις εἰ.

II. Περθεύς, Ἀγάνης παῖς, πατὴρ δ' Ἐχίονος.
Eur. *Bacchae* 506.

The first of these two verses Prof. Tyrrell calls a 'desperate verse' and says that he can only 'print it in its corrupt state.' Dr. Sandys prints ζθ' for οὐθ' before ὄστις. Both editors have long and perplexing notes, to which Dr. Sandys adds a 'Supplemental Note,' while in his *apparatus criticus* he gives a list of emendations of enormous length, no critic agreeing with any other critic and it being obviously easy to alter such a line in a hundred ways.

For myself I am like Pentheus in the presence of the god; I have not the slightest idea what the critics mean. Probably they may think that I deserve to be torn in pieces for my blindness, but I must risk that and proceed.

It is surely possible to say in Greek τί ζῆς; and τίς εἰ; or in Latin *quid vivis?* and *quis es?* (cf. Pers. 3. 67 *quid sumus aut quidnam victuri gignimur*). If you say to a person that he is ignorant of the answer to these questions, you say to him οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς οὐθ' ὄστις εἰ. If you wish to emphasize his ignorance by calling it 'blindness' too, you say,

οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς οὐδ' ὁρᾷς οὐθ' ὄστις εἰ.

If an exact explanation of ὅ τι ζῆς is demanded it would be 'that you have but the life of a mortal (*te mortalem vitam vivere*) and are but a mortal,' so that the claim you have just made to be 'more powerful' (*κυριώτερος*) than me—Dionysus—is absurd; but of course the charm of the line is in its affectation of philosophical language. The questions τί ζῶ; and τίς εἰμί; are like ποῦ στῶ; questions which philosophers propound to puzzle plain men. Dionysus with his quibbles is in this dialogue the typical philosopher and Pentheus the typical plain man. To Pentheus the deep problems which Dionysus suggests about 'life' and 'individual existence' are so much Hebrew, and, when told that he does 'not know or see who he is,' he answers with an accurate account of his name and parentage. The two lines must have been intensely funny to an audience who were accustomed to hear philosophers argue in the market-place. Their whole humour is now, however, buried beneath a heap of learned rubbish, the proper place of which is the dustbin.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS.

Aristoteles und Athen, von U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. 2 vols. Berlin. 1893. 20 Mk.

THESE two volumes, containing between them upwards of 800 closely printed pages, form decidedly the bulkiest contribution to the literature of the *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία* that has yet appeared. They are concerned with the subject-matter only of the treatise, questions of textual criticism being dealt with in a companion volume, entitled *Stil und Text*, by Kaibel, who was jointly responsible with Wilamowitz-Moellendorff for an edition of the text published in 1891. There is much, however, in the two volumes, especially in the second, that has only a very indirect bearing on the *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία*. The first volume is occupied in the main with an attempt to determine the sources of which Aristotle availed himself in the composition of his work; for it is assumed, as if it needed no proof, that Aristotle was the author of the 'Constitution of Athens.' The second volume furnishes us with a reconstruction of Athenian constitutional history on the basis of the *Politeia*, together with a number of essays on various points of Athenian history.

The inquiry into the authorities followed by Aristotle is at once the most original and the most ambitious part of the work, and it is by these chapters that the author would himself, in all probability, wish his labours to be judged. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Aristotle can advance no claim to be regarded as an independent investigator in the field of history; original research, we are given to understand, was alien to his nature, and appears to have been limited to an occasional consultation of Solon's poems. The sources from which he supposes that Aristotle derived his knowledge of Athenian history are four in number: (1) Herodotus, (2) Thucydides, (3) a source which is variously designated as 'the Chronicle,' 'the Atthis,' and 'the Atthidographs,' and (4) an oligarchical *tendenzschrift*. It is to the two latter sources that he considers that Aristotle owed most.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's theory as to source (3), so far as I understand it, may be stated thus. There are a large number of passages in the *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία* which are so different both in style and matter to the

rest of the work, and resemble one another so closely in both respects, that they must be derived from a common source. As to matter, they deal with facts rather than opinions; in point of style, they are distinguished by their brevity and by the precise dates they supply. These are the characteristics of a chronicle, and it is in a chronicle, in some form or other, that the common source must be sought. This chronicle, it is assumed, was based on contemporaneous records of noteworthy events, which began to be made before 600 B.C., and were worked up into histories, in the course of the fourth century, by a series of Atthidographers who flourished before the composition of the *Politeia*, of whom Androtion may be taken as a representative. These records however were not official in character—there were no fasti, in the strict sense, at Athens—; they were the work of many generations of *ἐξηγηταί*, who intended them for the guidance of their successors in office. The chronicle supplied Aristotle with the framework of the *Politeia*, and its statements, being derived from contemporaneous documents, form the sole trustworthy basis of Athenian history.

Clearly there is much in this theory that needs explanation, and still more that demands a good deal of evidence in its favour before it can be accepted. With regard to explanation, there is not a little that is left obscure. 'Die Chronik,' and 'die Atthis' are substituted for 'the Atthidographs,' and 'der Exeget' for the *ἐξηγηταί*, in a somewhat puzzling fashion. As I understand the theory, the chronicle proper—the 'urschrift,' as Wilamowitz-Moellendorff calls it—was known to Aristotle only through the medium of the Atthidographs. What then becomes of the argument from style, which is admitted to be the chief evidence for the hypothesis? Are we to suppose that the writers of the fourth century regarded the 'ur-atthis' as a sort of sacred text, which they were constrained to incorporate in their histories without the alteration of one jot or one tittle? If this is not implied, how are we to explain the statement that in ch. 22 we have a specimen of the chronicle 'unvermischt'? And, of course, in the *Politeia* we are dealing with the chronicle at third hand, at best. As to evidence, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that none is adduced. It is a reasonable

hypothesis enough that such passages as ch. 22, 2-8, or ch. 26, 2-4, may have been borrowed from an Atthidograph, though I fail to appreciate the improbability of Aristotle, if he were the author of the *Politeia*, having consulted *ψηφίσματα* for himself; it is, however, quite another thing to assume, on such slender grounds, that so large a part of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* is derived from a common source, or to postulate the existence of an 'urschrift.' Most readers will probably remain sceptical as to the existence in the fourth century of a chronicle dating back to the seventh; they may even still prefer the authority of Thucydides to that of the hypothetical exegete.

The oligarchical *tendenzschrift*, source (4), was a history of the Athenian constitution, published in the autumn of 404, as a manifesto of the moderate section among the Thirty. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff seems to be as confident about the authorship as about the date; it was the work of Theramenes, and its object was to prove from the history of the Athenian state the correctness of the interpretation which he and his party put upon the phrase *πάτριος πολιτεία*. To this 'grundschrift' Aristotle owed his knowledge of Draco's constitution, as well as most of what he has to tell us about the fifth century. Its statements, except in the case of Solon, were accepted by him without hesitation; a fact which explains, though it does not justify, his attitude towards Pericles and the demagogues.

Here there is the same lack of evidence as before. I am not concerned to deny that there is a very close connexion between the constitution attributed to Draco and the ideals of the Four Hundred, or that the account given in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* of Athenian politics in the fifth century is both prejudiced and inadequate. A good deal more than this, however, must be established before the existence of the oligarchical pamphleteer can be regarded as proved. The suggestion that this pamphleteer was Theramenes seems to me sufficiently improbable. We cannot, at any rate, attribute to him the narrative of his own death; yet, if a common source is assumed for the chapters relating to Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, the demagogues, and the Four Hundred, and if the chief ground for this assumption is that all these passages betray the same political sympathies, it seems unreasonable to assume a different source for the history of the Thirty, in which the point of view appears to be identical.

To turn from the sources to the subject-matter of the *Politeia*. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff claims to have established the right of Draco to a place among the constitution-makers of Athens. I cannot but think that his arguments afford convincing reasons for the opposite conclusion. He admits that there is so close a resemblance between ch. 4 and the constitutional schemes of the Four Hundred in ch. 30 and 31 that we must make our choice between two alternatives; either the constitution of Draco was the invention of a supporter of the Four Hundred, i.e. of the author of the *tendenzschrift*, who sought to gain credit for the *πάτριος πολιτεία* by fathering it upon Draco, or else it was rescued from oblivion by the legislators of the year 411, to whom it served as a model. He further concedes that there is no trace of antiquity in the language of ch. 4, that its contents were unknown to Aristotle when he wrote the *Politics*, and that it is inserted in so clumsy a fashion as to interrupt the connexion between ch. 3 and ch. 5. It may be added that the *tendenzschrift*, from which ch. 4 was borrowed, is supposed not to have come into Aristotle's possession until after the publication of the *Politics*—indeed it must have been quite at the eleventh hour that he stumbled on it, as he would appear not to have had time to adjust the account of Draco to the passages of the chronicle between which it had to be interpolated; and that it is suggested that Theramenes arrived at his account of Draco's constitution inductively, by a process of reasoning from those fragments of his legislation which were discovered during the revision of the laws.

The explanation of another well-known difficulty, that of the number and the names of Peisistratus' sons, is likely to give as little satisfaction as the hypothesis of an 'urschrift,' or this discovery 'of the book of the law.' Aristotle's version of the history of the Pisistratidae, resting upon the infallible authority of the chronicler, must be preferred to that of Thucydides, wherever the two conflict. Thucydides attributes to Hipparchus the part played by Thessalus in the *Politeia*, and knows but of three legitimate sons; the *Politeia* adds a fourth, Iophon, and makes Thessalus a surname of Hegesistratus. The statement of Thucydides cannot be set aside as a blunder, for he can quote the *σῆλη* in the Acropolis to prove it; even a chronicle cannot claim to be more infallible than an inscription. To save the credit of the Atthis, the hypothesis is put forward that Iophon was

omitted on the column because he was domiciled at Sigeum, and to make this hypothesis agree with Herodotus, according to whom the governor of Sigeum was Hegesistratus, it is suggested that the latter may have dropped his true name in favour of his *παρωνύμιον* Thessalus, and that the name Hegesistratus, being thus discarded, may have been adopted by Iophon as more euphonious than that which his father had bestowed upon him. Thus a Hegesistratus-Thessalus is matched by an Iophon-Hegesistratus. One is tempted to ask what a writer's canons of probability can be, when he accepts such an explanation as this, and rejects the presence of Hippias at Marathon, or the interview of Themistocles with the Molossian king, as wholly incredible.

In the account of Solon's legislation the *ὀροι* are explained as mortgage-pillars, and no allusion is made to any other view; the *ἐκτρήγοροι* are regarded as deriving their name from the receipt of a sixth part, not from its payment, and as being a class of day-labourers whose wages were paid in kind; while the account of the alteration of the standard, given in ch. 10, is admitted to

betray 'an almost incredible ignorance of the subject.' Aristotle is borrowing from Androtion, without understanding him.

Amongst other points it may be noticed that the *γεωμόροι* and *δημιουργοί* are treated as divisions of the nobility, on an equality in all respect with the *εὐπατρίδαι*; that the story of Themistocles and the Areopagus is pronounced a romance; and that ch. 24 is allowed to do its author as little credit as ch. 10. The explanation of *φίλος τῶν τυράννων* in ch. 20 can scarcely be adequate. 'Bicameral system' ('Zweikammersystem,' vol. I. p. 88) sounds to English ears an odd way of describing the relation of the *ecclesia* to the *boule*.

There are not a few omissions in the book, in spite of its length; perhaps the one most to be regretted is a discussion of the question of authorship. There must be a good many readers, who are ready to agree with the charges Wilamowitz-Moellendorf brings against the writer of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, who will yet hesitate to admit that one who deserves to be judged so severely can have been the author of the *Politics*.

E. M. WALKER.

FRACCAROLI'S PINDAR.

Le Odi di Pindaro dichiarate e tradotte da
GIUSEPPE FRACCAROLI, prof. ord. di letteratura greca nell' Università di Messina.
Verona. 1894.

THIS is a very handsome large octavo volume, paper covered, with pp. xvi. 732. It begins with 165 pp. of *Prolegomeni* on the life of Pindar, the chronological order of the odes, Greek lyric poetry, and the style art and *technique* of Pindar. All the extant odes are then taken one by one, and to a very searching and careful analysis is added a literal line-for-line version of each in Italian. This portion of the work comprises nearly 600 pp., though there is nothing which could be called a running commentary to serve the needs of explanation, and little discussion of the text. The familiarity displayed by the editor with the views of all who have written on or about Pindar in ancient or modern times and in various languages is quite marvellous. The style of the introductory essays and the notes is very pleasing, and if it does not attain to the brilliancy of the French school

in the hands of Villemain, at all events it affords a delightful contrast to the learned dryness of Boeckh, Dissen and Metzger.

The recent awakening to the astonishing qualities of Pindar's style is largely due to the striking and sympathetic criticism of Matthew Arnold; it has found its outward and visible sign in the beautiful prose version of Mr. Ernest Myers; and it constitutes not the least excellence of Mr. Bury's brilliant scholarly and eminently appreciative edition of the *Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Henceforth it may be presumed that no scholar will undertake the editing of Pindar without due attention to the aesthetic part of his task. It is not neglected by Prof. Fraccaroli, but might perhaps have claimed even more of his attention, seeing that it has been well nigh neglected till the present generation.

On the vexed question concerning the structure of the odes, Prof. Fraccaroli is disposed to take his side with those who accept the nomic theory, while about the doctrine of echoes and responsions he inclines to scepticism. The extensive and

minute learning of the μέγα βιβλίον is its main feature. On questions of explanation and criticism the editor has, as it seems to me, an undue reverence for the traditional and conventional. Hence it often happens that, while recording interpretations which are new and almost demonstrably sound and emendations which one would have supposed to be irresistibly convincing, he is content to fall back on the hitherto accepted translation and reading. Thus, to take a few instances, in *O.* iii. 45

οὐ μιν διώξω· κεινὸς εἶην

Prof. Gildersleeve has clearly shown that there is no omission of *ἄν*, or need to introduce metaphysical or psychological conceptions in explanation, but that the words are really optative, 'set me down as a fool' (if I do). So the same acute grammarian and tasteful critic explains *Pyth.* x. 21

θεὸς εἴη ἀπήμων κέαρ,

and nearly in the same way *Pyth.* iv. 118

οὐ ξείναν ἰκοίμαν γαῖαν,

the *οὐ* being adhaerent, and the optative a half wish or a thought begotten of a wish, 'I hope it will turn out that it is to no strange land have I come.'

The two first passages are thus rendered by Prof. Fraccaroli:

Non vo' cercarlo :—saria vanità ;

and

Chi ha il cuor senza dolori un Nume egli è.

In the third he seems to try to give the pure optative some meaning different from the optative with *ἄν*, but is hardly within the limits of the Greek in rendering

Stranier non venni, credo, in terra altrui.

In *N.* iv. 93 he renders αἰνέων 'praising' not 'emulating,' which Mr. Bury shows conclusively to be the right meaning. In *N.* v. 44 he still translates ἀπαρε as if it were ἡπαρε and meant 'pleased' or 'favoured' instead of 'clave to.' He gives the impossible meaning of *al par* to θάμα in *N.* vii. 20, and in *N.* ix. 23, accepting ἐρυσσάμενοι, he does not attempt to explain how

γλυκὺν νόστον ἐρυσσάμενοι

came to mean

Mentre il dolce ritorno aveano in cor.

To turn to criticism, there is no sign in the translation that Prof. Fraccaroli accepts Bergk's certain restoration of ἐὰν for εἰ τὰν in *N.* vii. 25, nor Mr. Bury's nearly as certain correction of σὺν μάχαις to συμμάχοις in *I.* iv.(v.) 35,¹ nor Mr. Fennell's highly probable περὶ γάζων for πεδονγάζων in *N.* x. 61, nor Bergk's ξυνόδαμον in *I.* v. (vi.) 46, which as defended by Mr. Bury is better than anything which has been proposed. But the most striking example of a determination to tread the old paths in spite of most seductive and, as I think, irresistible invitations to the new is to be found in *I.* vi. (vii.); and on this ode I will ask leave to dwell for a little, because it illustrates perfectly what a scientific instrument a just aesthesis becomes in the hands of a critic like Bergk. That admirable scholar observed that in the penultimate line of the second epode of this piece the reading 'Ἀμφιάρῳν τε must be wrong, because it could not be believed that Pindar, in glorifying Strepsiades who fell in battle for Thebes, and in comparing him with Hector and Meleager who died for their country, would couple with these heroes Amphiarus, who was slain (or rather was swallowed up alive by the earth) not in fighting for, but in leading an expedition against, his fatherland, the very country in defence of which Strepsiades fell. Bergk, fortified by many other excellent arguments which I have not space here to quote, reads ἄν 'Ἀμφιάρειον' 'by the temple of Amphiarus,' the place where Strepsiades met his death in battle. This palmary emendation is accepted by Metzger and Mr. Bury, who indeed improves it by reading ἀμφ' for ἄν. Prof. Fraccaroli falls back on the old reading, though the conjecture of Bergk not only completely restores the sense, but also, in modifying the metre slightly, carries with it too almost equally certain, though very minute, changes in the corresponding verse of the other two epodes in the piece.

In this connexion perhaps I may be permitted to put forward a few arguments in support of two suggestions on this ode made by myself. The first is to read ἡ ὄρ' for ὁ ὄρ' in the sixth verse. This removes a very great difficulty which perhaps has

¹ The point of the passage is that the Aeacids were always called on when a great enterprise was a-foot and that they never failed to bring their power to bear. A similar correction has restored συμμάχων δορός for σὺν μάχῃ δορός in Soph. *Ant.* 674.

not presented itself in a sufficiently strong light to the editors. According to the ordinary reading Pindar thus begins the ode:

'In which of the deeds done in thy clime hast thou had most delight, O blessed Thebe? Was it when thou broughtest to fulness Dionysus of the flowing locks? Or when thou didst receive the mightiest of the gods in a midnight shower of gold, what time (*ὅπότε*) he took his stand within Amphitryon's doors, and approached his wife to the begetting of Herakles? Or when &c.'

Thus Zeus is said to have come to Alcmena as he came to Danaë in a shower of gold. The leading incident in the tale of Danaë might well be transferred to other myths. Indeed, we hear in *O. vii. 34* of Zeus snowing gold when Athene was born. But how is such a feature in the myth to be reconciled with the words of the present passage? Does not *σταθείς* 'taking his stand' preclude such a view? Moreover, in *N. x. 15* Pindar tells the tale of the beguiling of Alcmena by Zeus who, he says, 'In the likeness of Amphitryon entered his halls with the seed that was to beget the dauntless Heracles.'

All these difficulties are met by the simple correction of *ὅπότε* to *ἢ ὅτ'*, which is metrically equivalent. We have then to suppose that the fifth verse refers to a visit of Zeus to Thebe in a shower of gold, the sixth alluding naturally to the story of the wooing of Alcmena, as it is familiar to us, and as it is related elsewhere by Pindar.

The second suggestion in the same ode is on the passage in the second epode which runs

ἴστω... ἄστων γενεᾷ μέγιστον κλέος αὔξων
ζῶων τ' ἀπὸ καὶ θανάων,

'let him be certified that he increases to the highest the glory of his fellow-citizens—both living and when he is dead.'

But the order of *ἀπὸ καὶ θανάων* for *καὶ ἀποθανόνων* is very suspicious, especially in Pindar. A change of accentuation (which is no change at all) turns these words into

ζῶων τ' ἄπο καὶ θανάων,

'both from the mouths of the living (that

is, his contemporaries) and after his death'; and thus we have a characteristic instance of Pindar's passion for variety of construction, of which we have many examples in his odes, *e.g. N. x. 41*

νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὅσαις (ἐταῖς Bury)...
ἄστνυ θάλησεν Κορίνθον τ' ἐν μυχοῖς καὶ Κλεωναιῶν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν

'prizes won in Corinth and at the hands of Cleonaeans'; *N. iv. 19*

ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν Θήβας τ' ἐν ἐπταπύλοις

'crowns (carried off) from Athens and (won) in Thebes'; *I. vii. (viii.) 5*

Ἰσθμιάδος τε νίκας ἄποινα καὶ Νεμέαι
ἀέθλων ὅτι κράτος ἐξεῦρε

'meed of an Isthmian victory and for winning at Nemea'; and *ib. 35*

Διὶ δαμαζομένην ἢ Διὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν

'wedded to Zeus or with (one of) his brothers.'

Prof. Fraccaroli will no doubt have many to applaud him for his maintenance of time-honoured readings and interpretations, and, as he does not present his readers with a Greek text, perhaps it is unreasonable to demand from him too minute an examination of that which he translates. The book is certainly a mine of Pindaric lore. Every foreign and English editor has been carefully studied, and the notes are full of *il Gildersleeve*, *il Fennell*, *il Bury*. Moreover, the editor is familiar with articles and even short notes on Pindar in various magazines foreign and British, such as the *Rheinisches Museum*, *Jahrsbericht*, *Hermes*, *Philologus*, *Commentationes Philologicae Monacenses*, *Quarterly Review*, *Classical Review*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, *Journal of Philology* both American and English. The book does much credit to Italian erudition, and it occupies and will maintain a high place among the works of those who have taken upon themselves the difficult but eminently commendable task of attempting to analyse the art and interpret the mind of the most characteristic product of Hellenic genius.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

HOFFMANN'S GREEK DIALECTS.

Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen dargestellt, von DR. OTTO HOFFMANN. Zweiter Band. *Der nord-achäische Dialekt*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1893. 14 Mk.

THE second volume of Hoffmann's work is entitled *The North-Achaean Dialect*. In very early times, he conceives, one of the two branches of the great Achaean stock was confined to Thessaly. Thence went forth two colonies, one eastward to Lesbos and the north-west corner of Asia Minor, the other southward to the district afterwards called Boeotia. The language spoken before the separation the author here seeks to restore by a comparison of the Aeolic and Thessalian dialects, as in the first volume the southern branch of Achaean was reconstructed from Arcadian and Cyprian. In this restoration the dialect of the colony which settled in Boeotia is but sparingly used, for the incursions of a North Doric people, the Βοιωτοί, produced a mixed speech, North Doric in its sounds, North Achaean in its forms, which has been reserved for separate treatment at the end of the third volume, after the North and Middle Doric dialects. While it may be conceded that the mixture in Boeotian is so great that it could not successfully be grouped with either North Achaean or North Doric, the very necessity of its separate treatment is a vindication of the method of Meister so severely criticized by Hoffmann in the preface to his first volume. That method certainly has its uses and advantages as well as the system of grouping, and should naturally precede it. The grouping can be carried out more successfully after the facts of each dialect by itself have been carefully collected and arranged, and the task of Hoffmann has certainly been rendered much more simple by the labours in the separate dialects of those who have preceded him.

A striking feature of this volume is the great mass of unnecessary material. Of the 620 pages 244 are devoted to 'eine ausführliche kritische Bearbeitung der Quellen,' which to the author appeared necessary. It is doubtful if many will agree with him. One is grateful for the collection of inscriptions discovered since

the publication of the Collitz-Bechtel *Sammlung* and not elsewhere brought together, but all these might have been given within the compass of fifty pages, and of those already published it would have been enough to give a list of the changes he desired to make. For the insertion of the fragments of the lyric poets no sufficient reason can be given. The edition of Bergk is satisfying to most minds, and it is hard to find what Hoffmann has added to it. He has, indeed, restored many Aeolic forms according to the known laws of the dialect, but such corrections give no support, other than negative, to those laws. The question arises, Will the fourth volume, which is to deal with Ionic, contain a similar treatment of the literature of that dialect, and present us perhaps with an edition of Herodotus corrected to agree with the inscriptional evidence?

Few will deny that the space taken up by this superfluous matter would have been far better given to the 'Wortbildung,' 'Wortschatz' and 'Syntax' which it has crowded out.

As for the main part of the work, the treatment of the sounds and forms, the greatest praise is due on account of the fulness of the material and the clearness of its arrangement. On the former of these points, however, a few words should be said. In giving full lists of the examples in which a dialect has preserved or changed the sounds of the original speech, Hoffmann and other recent writers on the Greek dialects have followed a much better method than that of Meister, who in general has contented himself with citing peculiarities of form merely. It is necessary that *all* the facts should be present to determine the limits within which a change has taken place, and explain it as far as possible. But, when an author is attempting, as in this work, to prove an original unity of certain dialects, this abundance of examples is deceptive, and seems to prove far more than it really does. On glancing through the pages treating the vowels, and observing the long list of words in which Thessalian and Aeolic agree, the impression is received, and rightly, that these two dialects after all differed but very little. But most of these words

show exactly the same form in other dialects, and however much this may prove for the original unity of all Greek dialects, it proves nothing for the separate existence of an Aeolic-Thessalian group. That can be shown only by the common possession of peculiarities of form, and to determine this the attention must be confined to just such words as Meister is in the habit of citing, and the comparison can be made almost as easily in his work as in Hoffmann's. The dangers incident to the method of arrangement followed by the latter are well illustrated by his treatment of \tilde{a} . This occupies twenty pages. Thirteen of these contain examples common to all dialects: the remainder deal with words in which 'to a North Achaean \tilde{a} another vowel corresponds in other dialects.' Yet not one of the examples of the latter kind is certainly common to Aeolic and Thessalian. Aeolic alone uses $\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, and $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$; Thessalian alone, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, and $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{o}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$. This is an exceptional case, of course, and there are sufficient resemblances between Aeolic and Thessalian to prove a close connexion between the two. In dealing with these dialects, and with Arcadian and Cyprian, where the relationship had before been recognized, Hoffmann is perhaps justified in letting the work of proof and reconstruction go together, but when he treats of dialects whose exact relationship has not yet been determined, the reader will require to be first convinced that they are to be grouped by themselves, before receiving the collection of their common forms as a reconstruction of the original language of the group.

In his explanations of the facts of the dialects Hoffmann has naturally found little that is new in material so frequently worked over before. His views are always worthy of attention, and, where doubt may arise, he has always considerable evidence in his favour.

That Aeolic $\alpha\upsilon\omicron$, $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$, &c. (in $\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\varsigma$, &c.) arose from $\alpha\sigma\omicron$ &c., $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\omicron$ &c., or $\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ &c., must be regarded as not proven. There is no evidence that medial σ dropped σ and not ς : the Cyprian $\tau\tilde{\alpha}$ $\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{s}$ = $\tau\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{s}$ $\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{s}$ gives slight hold for such a result in Aeolic; on the other hand there is $\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, Sappho 91, from $\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$. If we turn to $\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$ instead of $\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$ as the original form of $\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\varsigma$, the difficulty remains of explaining the long \tilde{a} in Doric $\nu\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, Ionic $\nu\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$. The different resultants of the combination $\nu\tilde{s}$ are not clearly brought out. The statement on p. 479, that 'the spirants were

assimilated to a neighbouring nasal by the North Achaeans,' implies that this change took place, not in primitive Greek, but after the separation into dialects, and it is not stated that $\nu\tilde{s}$ final remained at that time unchanged. On p. 414 we read that 'In Aeolic the three short-vowel diphthongs $\tilde{a}\tilde{i}$, $\tilde{e}\tilde{i}$, $\tilde{o}\tilde{i}$, and the diphthong $\tilde{o}\tilde{i}$ arose from a ν before σ , passing over as nasalis sonans into \tilde{i} .' Now it is true that $\alpha\upsilon\tilde{s}$, $\epsilon\upsilon\tilde{s}$, and $\omicron\upsilon\tilde{s}$ became in Aeolic $\alpha\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$, $\epsilon\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$, and $\omicron\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$, but that is no ground for stating that $\nu\tilde{s}$ became $\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$. As Hoffmann himself states on p. 416, there is no example of $\nu\tilde{s}$ from $\nu\tilde{s}$, and as for supposing that $\tau\tilde{\rho}\tilde{i}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{s}$ became $\tilde{*}\tau\tilde{\rho}\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$, which afterwards contracted into $\tau\tilde{\rho}\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$, it is difficult to believe that $\tau\tilde{\rho}\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$ ever existed anywhere except on paper. The exact nature of the phonetic change of $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tilde{s}$ to $\alpha\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$ I leave to others to discuss, but I gain no enlightenment from the statement that $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tilde{s} > \alpha\tilde{i}\tilde{s} > \alpha\tilde{u}\tilde{s}$. On p. 392 $\beta\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, a patronymic, is derived from $\tilde{*}\beta\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{i}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, through $\tilde{*}\beta\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{i}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, by dropping of \tilde{i} before \tilde{o} and contraction of $\tilde{e}\tilde{o}$ to \tilde{i} . Yet only a single certain example of $\tilde{e}\tilde{o}$ losing its \tilde{i} before a vowel is cited (p. 451), though surely that law must have been a well-established one before a further contraction could take place as a result of it. It is not strange that Hoffmann is somewhat doubtful of his explanation. What need of supposing $\beta\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$ to be anything but the patronymic of $\beta\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$? The name was applied to men (see Pape). There are other points to be criticized in the treatment of vowel contraction. Thus, while the sound which originally separated the vowels is used as a basis of distinction, it is not pointed out that this matter resolves itself into one of chronology. If $\alpha\tilde{e} < \alpha\tilde{t}\tilde{e}$ was contracted to \tilde{a} , while $\alpha\tilde{e} < \alpha\tilde{f}\tilde{e}$ remained open, then the conclusion must be drawn that such forms as $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{i}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}$, &c., where no intervening consonant is to be assumed, are late formations, later than the contraction of $\alpha\tilde{e} < \alpha\tilde{t}\tilde{e}$. Again it is said that $\tilde{e}\tilde{o}\tilde{e}$, $\tilde{e}\tilde{f}\tilde{e}$, were contracted in $\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{o}\tilde{\nu}$, $\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$, but in all other cases remained open. The fact is that like vowels were regularly contracted. If the inscriptions show such a form as $\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{s}$, it is due to the influence of other cases, $\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{o}\tilde{\nu}$ &c., and is probably a mere matter of orthography, just as in Attic inscriptions towards the end of the fourth century $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{s}$ appeared for the earlier $\tilde{E}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{e}\tilde{i}\tilde{s}$.

The index to the volume is incomplete, a defect not compensated for by the excellent arrangement. On p. 314 $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{i}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{o}\tilde{\nu}$ should read $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{i}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{o}\tilde{\nu}$.

In conclusion it may be said that, on account of the richness of the material, students of Greek dialects cannot afford to be without this book. But the chief end of the work is as yet brought no nearer. We

have not yet been shown that the Greek dialects can be arranged in three main groups.

A. G. LAIRD.

Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

SOMMERBRODT'S LUCIAN.

Lucianus. Recognovit JULIUS SOMMERBRODT.
Vol. I. Pars. II. Berlin, Weidmann.
1889. M. 6.
Vol. II. Pars. I. 1893. M. 6.

PROBABLY no man is better equipped by long experience for bringing out an edition of Lucian than the editor of the present text edition. Since 1853, when the first volume of his *Selections* appeared, Sommerbrodt has been more or less actively engaged in editing and emending Lucian, and has thus had ample opportunity for becoming well acquainted with the literature of his author. In the present work, of which the first part of the first volume appeared in 1886, Sommerbrodt proposes to give us a complete edition of the text of Lucian together with a critical commentary and the readings of the best manuscripts. In his preface however he lays down a principle for establishing the text which will hardly be approved by all scholars, namely that of consulting only a few manuscripts which he regards as the best, and then, if their readings prove unsatisfactory, of emending the text to suit the passage in question.

Sommerbrodt thinks there is no common source for the large mass of existing manuscripts of Lucian, and makes no attempt to follow up the work of Rothstein in tracing the connexion between them and separating them into families. He therefore discards as worthless all the manuscripts except some sixteen, upon which he relies for his text. Of these he considers Vindob. 123 (B), Vat. 87 (U), Vat. 90 (Γ), Laur. 77 (Φ), Marc. 436 (Ψ), Mut. 193, Marc. 434 (Ω) together with Vat. 1324 and Paris. 3673 (Ath.) the best. But wherever a passage seems obscure Sommerbrodt follows his plan of resorting to conjecture to remove the difficulty, sometimes adopting the emendations of other scholars and sometimes making suggestions of his own; but in a few places he is forced to acknowledge that he is not satisfied with any of the suggestions which have been made.

A general idea of the emendations adopted into the text may be obtained from the following passages taken from the *Alexander*. In ch. 4 (end) the editor changes *ἐπινοεῖν* to *ἐννοεῖν* on the ground that the latter word is more appropriate. In ch. 8 he follows Hemsterhuys and Fritzsche in inserting *τυράννων* in the phrase *ὑπὸ δυνεὶ τοῖν μεγίστῳ τυραννοῦμενον τυράννων*, *ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου*, the manuscripts reading *ὑπὸ δυνεὶ τοῦτον (τοῖν ΨΥ) τυραννοῦμενον*, *ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου*. In ch. 10 he changes *ὀλίγης δὲ τῆς περὶ τοῦτο στάσεως* to *οὐκ ὀλίγης δὲ κ.τ.λ.* and in ch. 30 for *τὰ μὲν ἰδόντες, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἰδόντες καὶ ὡς ἀκούσαντες* he adopts the conjecture *τὰ μὲν ἰδόντες, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἰδόντος ἀκούσαντες*. Again in ch. 32 he emends *ἀλλὰ καὶ μηχανεῖται* to *καὶ ἄλλο τι μηχανεῖται*. In all these passages the emendations may make the text easier, but the reading of the manuscripts can be understood without great difficulty, and a more conservative editor would doubtless hesitate before adopting some of the conjectures offered.

The *lectiones codicum* which are placed together at the end of each half of each volume call for favourable comment. They are clearly arranged and apparently very complete for the manuscripts which the editor has consulted. All variations from the Teubner text edition of Lucian by Jacobitz are noted. The various readings and emendations preferred by the editor are discussed separately in the *adnotatio critica*.

A typographical improvement which should not pass unnoticed is the printing of the numbers of the chapters of each selection in the margin as well as in the text. This makes reference to this edition very much easier than to the Teubner text edition or to the edition of Fritzsche where the number of a chapter is frequently hidden away in the middle of a page of text.

The contents of these two volumes are, in vol. i. part ii. the *adnotatio critica* to parts one and two and the *lectiones codicum*

to part two besides the text in the usual order from *Charon* through the *Scythia s. Hospes*; in vol. ii. part i. the text from *Quomodo Hist. sit Conscrib.* through the *Vita Demonactis* together with the *lectiones*

codicum and the *adnotatio critica* to the text. This edition is distinctly an improvement on previous complete text editions.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

Harvard University.

TAPPERTZ ON THE USE OF THE CONJUNCTIONS IN MANILIUS.

De coniunctionum usu apud Manilium quaestiones selectae. Scripsit EDUARDUS TAPPERTZ. Munster. 1892.

This dissertation may be considered supplementary to the two treatises of Cramer *de Manilii qui dicitur elocutione* and *der Infinitiv bei Manilius*. The *Lucubrationes* of M. Paul Thomas naturally and necessarily form the groundwork of it; but the author has utilized various other contributions which in the last decennium have been made to the study of Manilius by Bechert, Cartault, Breiter, Rossberg, Krämer and others, including my own *Noctes Manilianae*. It is satisfactory to find that the study not only of the Roman astrological poet, but of other writers on the stars, Greek or Roman, is steadily progressing. A new edition of the *Mathesis* of Firmicus Maternus has just been issued by the indefatigable press of Teubner: and the same firm promise editions of the *Εισαγωγή* of Geminus, and the Commentary of Hipparchos on Aratus' *Phaenomena*, based on MSS. not examined before.

The most important section of Tappertz' dissertation is that on the copulative particles *et, que, ac (atque), nec (neque)*. These are treated with considerable minuteness, and though, probably for want of space, the

citations are often given only in outline, any one who wishes to arrive at an idea of Manilius' style will get a very fair idea of it by simply reading through pp. 8—51. Very instructive are the details given by Tappertz as to the way in which M. constructs his long-drawn sentences by the most varied combinations of *et* and *que*. All readers of the *Astronomics* know that one of the chief difficulties in the grammar of the poem is its linking together of clauses not always clear either as to their connexion with each other or as to their relation with the leading idea of the sentence.

Incidentally a number of disputed passages are discussed, and the leading views of the most eminent Manilian critics, notably Bentley and Jacob, to say nothing of those whom the last half-century has produced, are brought under revision. Tappertz has also propounded views of his own which are worth considering. Now that the prose Astrology of Firmicus, which seems largely indebted to Manilius, is accessible to every one, we may confidently look forward to a new treatment of the various questions which a comparison of the two works, separated by a long interval of time, cannot fail to give rise to.

R. E.

BLÜMNER'S HOME LIFE OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS.

The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, translated from the German of Prof. H. BLÜMNER by ALICE ZIMMERN. Pp. xv. + 548, with 206 illustrations. 7s. 6d. Cassell & Co.: London. 1893.

THIS is a translation of Prof. Blümner's well-known *Leben und Sitten der Griechen* (Prague 1887). The English title is somewhat misleading, as it contains chapters on

'religious worship, public festivals, the theatre, war and seafaring,' as well as on private antiquities.

The three volumes of the German edition have been brought into one, the references to authorities are placed at the end of the work and the list of the source of the illustrations is omitted. In its new form the work is more carefully printed, but costs double the original price (3s.).

Dr. Blümner's work is professedly popular and gives a concise account of such public and private antiquities as are intelligible to the general reader. Its value is much increased by the illustrations, which are drawn from recent sources and on the whole well reproduced. Most of these, especially the vase-paintings, are new to the English public, which as a rule has to be contented with *clichés* twenty or thirty years old.

The great defect of the work is the absence of any guide as to the date, *provenance* or present home of the originals, a defect which is made worse by the omission (mentioned above) of the sources from which the illustrations are taken. This however is rather a specialist's objection, for Prof. Blümner does not forget to state that the monuments and antiquities considered are those of the sixth to the fourth century B.C.

The translation is readable but marred by many slips and inaccuracies, most of which are due to a defective knowledge of the subject-matter.

Most unfortunately the worst chapter is the first—that on 'costume.' The German text is far from satisfactory, for it is not fully intelligible without some acquaintance with Greek art and archaeological literature. A most amusing instance of the pitfalls into which the translator has fallen is to be found in the account of the apron or loincloth (*Lenden oder Hüftenschurz*) which was the primitive under-garment of the Greeks. 'Besides the chiton the older male costume also had a sort of bib (*δελιοιδιον*). It is by no means impossible that at one period the Greeks wore only the bib and the cloak and no chiton. When the latter became universally fashionable (which according to recent surmises was due to Semitic influence), the bib disappeared, or continued only as part of military dress' (p. 6). A Greek dressed in a bib and cloak reminds one irresistibly of the topboots and collar of the savage king, but the translator's addition of *δελιοιδιον* makes her views on the subject only too clear. The mistake is unfortunate, for later on, in describing the tucker or fold which hangs over the breast in front of the chiton (*Brustüberschlag*), she uses the same word 'bib,' except in one case

where she calls it a 'scarf' (pp. 11, 12). This makes the confusion worse, for she also calls the small mantle or shawl (*umschlagetuch* p. 41, *Echarpe* p. 43) shown in some of the early red-figured vase-paintings a 'scarf.'

Some other translations are equally misleading, e.g. *Faltenwurf* is 'drapery' instead of 'arrangement of folds' (pp. 9, 45), and *Bausch* or *Kolpos* becomes 'double-girding.'

Besides these more obvious errors there are several smaller inaccuracies which seriously affect the meaning, e.g. 'The monuments of the next period' (*nunmehr*) (p. 9), and the translation of *Bildwerke* by 'pictures' in one place (p. 9) and 'statues' in another (p. 18). The rest of the book is much freer from mistakes and is for the most part very readable. The worst slip we have noticed is in the account of the *discobolus* (p. 277), where the German translation of Lucian's description is very inaccurately rendered, making the account which follows almost unintelligible. There are also here and there some curious renderings: the handle (*Henkel*) of a vase is called a 'haft' (p. 281): the 'Basilina (*sic*) the wife of the Archon chief' (p. 386) represents *Basilinna d. h. die Gemählin des Archon Basileus*: 'The feast of Cans' (*χοαι sic*) stands for *Kannenfest*.'

It is indeed a great pity that the translation has not been revised by some one with a special knowledge of Greek antiquities, for it fills a vacant space among our handbooks, supplying an amount of monumental evidence that is sadly wanting elsewhere, and giving in short compass a large amount of information on comparatively neglected subjects.

In spite of the errors, the translator deserves our best thanks. She has given the general reader a large mass of information by the aid of which he can reclothe the dry bones of antiquity and learn to look on the old Greeks as people who lived and moved, much as we do. The translation will, we hope, reach a second edition and afford the opportunity of clearing away the 'slips' which at present detract from its value.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

JOHNSON ON THE SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE IN EURIPIDES.

De Coniunctivi et Optativi Usu Euripideo in Enuntiatis Finalibus et Condicionalibus.
Scripsit FRANCISCUS JOHNSON, Dr. Phil.
Berlin: 1893. Richard Heinrich. Pp. 70.
2 Mk.

APPARENTLY Dr. Johnson has examined all the cases in Euripides coming under the heads of Pure Final Clauses, Object Clauses after Verbs of Striving, Object Clauses after Verbs of Fearing, and Conditional Sentences, treating some of the cases at length while others he merely cites. His classification, owing to its intricacy and want of clearness in arrangement, is very hard to follow, and whatever be the merits of the treatise it must be admitted that it shows carelessness in construction. For example on p. 36, section iii., on the mood after *ἴνα*, *ἴνα μή*, *ὥς*, *ὥς μή*, *ὅπως*, *ὅπως μή*, and *μή* alone depending on past tenses, we have first a summary of the preceding section, the first clause of which reads: Supra ii., (*ἴνα*) invenimus locos v., while in reality there are six; and finally: Itaque locis lviii. optativus, viii. coniunctivus invenitur; neque vero metrum obstat quominus hi loci viii. corrigantur. Inde concludo Euripidem coniunctivum numquam sic adhibuisse. Now he cannot mean that he thinks Euripides never used the Subjunctive at all after past tenses, for he gives on p. 12, p. 24, &c., abundant instances to the contrary. What he does mean probably is that he thinks Euripides never used the Subjunctive except when the action of the leading verb is conceived of as continuing into the present (cf. examples on p. 12). But he does not explicitly state this, and in any case the assertion is a remarkable one.

Other instances of carelessness are as follows: on p. 41 one of his divisions (B. I. c.) is the Subjunctive after *ὥς ἂν μή*, where the example contains no *μή* at all; and on p. 64, (a ε) and p. 65 (c. ε, ααζ, cη et cη), where *con.* is put for *opt.*

Dr. Johnson's general conclusions may be summarized as follows: In the use of the Subjunctive and Optative in final clauses Euripides does not differ much from Sophocles and Aeschylus, for these three poets (1) used *ὥς* rather oftener than the other particles, Euripides somewhat more than the other two, and Sophocles considerably more than Aeschylus; (2) *μή* alone in adverbial clauses they used a little oftener than *μή* with *ἴνα*, *ὥς*, *ὅπως*, Euripides in about the same proportion as Aeschylus and Sophocles; (3) they used the Optative after past tenses when an action simply past was had in mind; (4) they used the Optative when the Optative occurred in the principal clause, but possibly Euripides preferred the Subjunctive after ideas of wishing, though this is not certain; (5) Euripides was the first poet after Homer to omit the idea of fearing, &c., before *μή*, or rather he first returned to the old way of expression; (6) *ὅπως μή* after a verb of fearing occurs once in Euripides; (7) Euripides with the other tragedians used the Subjunctive after primary tenses.

With regard to conditional sentences Dr. Johnson concludes: (1) in Euripides as in Aeschylus and Sophocles both *ἴν* and *εἰ*, but *εἰ* never except *metri causa*, while the form *ἄν* does not occur; (2) Euripides never used the Subjunctive with *εἰ*; (3) Euripides much oftener, Sophocles a little less often, used *ἴν* with the Subjunctive than *εἰ* with the Future Indicative, while Aeschylus almost always used *εἰ* with the Future Indicative. Euripides therefore of all the tragedians most nearly followed the speech of the people; (4) Euripides often used *εἰ* with the Optative in general conditions.

An index of passages discussed and emended would have facilitated reference to this treatise.

W. J. BATTLE.

University of Texas,
Austin.

ROBERTS'S SHORT PROOF THAT GREEK WAS THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST.

A Short Proof that Greek was the Language of Christ, by PROFESSOR ROBERTS, D.D.
Alex. Gardner: Paisley and London.
1893.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS supplements his larger work of 1888 by a brief argument addressed to a wider circle of readers. The proof may be condensed as follows:—

1. The whole Old Testament circulated in some *written* form, as is shown by Christ's appeals to 'the Scriptures' and by such phrases as 'have ye not read?' or 'as it is written.'

2. This 'People's Bible' was not Hebrew, a language now unintelligible to the common people addressed by Christ, nor can the existence of a written Aramaic version be asserted.

3. Therefore 'by a process of exhaustion' we infer that this People's Bible was the Septuagint, a conclusion supported by the constant use of the LXX. for quotations of the Old Testament in the New. The Aramaic expressions in the Gospels represent then only an occasional use, and the discourses of Christ were delivered in Greek.

The argument is singularly inconclusive. It ignores the purely formal value of *ὡς γέγραπται* and *αἱ γραφαί*. They are appeals to the contents of the Old Testament irrespective of the manner in which it is known. Professor Roberts overestimates the circulation of books among the peasants of Palestine and ignores the significance of oral translation into Aramaic by the Metur-

geman in the synagogues. Whether that usage can be dated as early as the time of Christ or not, such passages as Mark xv. 34 attest some acquaintance with the Old Testament in Aramaic. The unintelligibility of Hebrew is overstated, as may be seen by the interesting remarks of Franz Delitzsch in his pamphlet *The Hebrew New Testament*, p. 30. Kautzsch (*Grammatik des biblischen Aramäischen*, p. 19) indeed infers from Luke iv. 17 that the Hebrew Bible could still be understood by the people.

Lastly, the use of the LXX. in quotations by writers addressing non-Palestinian readers proves nothing as to the common use of the LXX. in Galilee.

If the author's conclusion could be granted, its importance would not be such as he imagines. We could not infer that we are reading the sayings of Christ exactly as they were originally uttered. The difficulties which beset the criticism of the Gospels would remain undisturbed.

F. A. CHRISTIE.

*Meadville Theological Seminary,
Pennsylvania.*

ARCHAEOLOGY.

INSCRIPTIONS FROM KOS AND HALICARNASSUS.

(1) Kos. In the possession of Mr. Ioannides; complete stele, width 38 cm. The forms of the most important letters are Μ Ρ Σ Ξ Υ.

Ἐδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ
δῶμῳ· Πολύαρχος Στασί-
λα εἶπε· Χαρίαν Ἀριστοκρά-
τεος Ἀθηναίων πρόξενον
ἦμεν τῆς πόλιος τῆς Κώ-
ων καὶ εὐεργέταν καὶ αὐ-
τὸν καὶ ἐκγόνους· ἦμεν δὲ
αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔσπλουν καὶ ἐκ-
πλουν καὶ ἐμ πολέμῳ καὶ
ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀστυλεῖ καὶ ἀσπον-
δεῖ καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ χρήμασιν.

A Coan decree of proxeny more succinct than any of those previously known (Paton and Hicks, *Inscript. of Cos*, Nos. 1-3) and remarkable in omitting *γνωμὰ προστατῶν* after the first sentence. I have not here the index to the *C.I.A.* vol 2 and cannot discover if anything is known about the Athenian here benefited.

(2) I espied this in 1886 in a street in Kos. It had just been excavated by some workmen. I discovered it in an old note-book a few days ago. The stone has doubtless been lost, as I could find no trace of it in 1888. I prefer to reproduce my copy without any attempt at restoration, as it is evident that a great deal is lost. As to the accuracy of the copy I will beg that it may be estimated by a low standard, as this is one of the very first copies of Greek inscriptions I made, and I know now that it takes a long time to learn how to copy them with any approach to accuracy.

ΡΙΩΙΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΘΕΟΥΣΕ
ΣΑΣΕΧΕΙΠΑΡΑΥΤΟ
ΜΙΟΝΕΣΤΩΓΤΑΣΑΣΕ
ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΝ
Ρ'ΣΕΒΑΣ ἸΓΓΓ
ΟΔΕΥ ΟΝΑΙ
ΟΣΤΟΤΡΙΤΟΝΠΑ
ΙΔΑΣΕΙΚΟΣΙΠΕΝΤ

(3) In the collection of Mr. Platanistas. Mr. Demetrios Platanistas, the father of

the present Mr. Platanistas, acquired this stone, as he told Mr. Newton (*Halicarnassus, Cnidus, &c.*, p. 580), at Cara Toprak near Myndus; but, although there are other traces of the cultus of Artemis in this region (see *Bull. Hell.* xiv. p. 118), I do not think that this evidence suffices to establish the existence of a cult of Artemis Kindyas near Myndus. Kindya was near Bargylia, I think, on a hill above the village of Cholmekji. It was an important place in the fifth century, paying to Athens a much bigger tribute than Bargylia, and its Artemis (see Strabo) continued to be famous for long; but nevertheless I think it is more probable that this stone was carried from Bargylia to Myndus than that the worship of Artemis Kindyas was so carried.

(1) Height 38 cm., width 44 cm. Letters A M E C W Z.

Τὸ μνημεῖον Φουρσίων[ος
'Αττάλον καὶ Δάμα καὶ
Δημητρίον ἐν ᾧ κη-
δευθήσονται αὐτοὶ
καὶ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ
τέκνα καὶ εἴ τινας (τισιν!) αὐτοὶ ζῶν-
τες συνχωρήσουσιν. Ἐὰν δέ

τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσῃ ἀπο-
τείσει Ἀρτέμιδι Κινδυά-
δι ✕φ

Beneath KINΔYA is engraved an ivy leaf.

This inscription may have been already published long ago in the *Πανδώρα* or *Ὀμηρος*, but it is interesting enough to be reproduced here. It is not cited by Hirschfeld in his catalogue of sepulchral inscriptions with fines.

HALICARNASSUS.

The castle of St. Peter is being converted into a prison. I fancy that no great harm will be done, as scarcely anything architectural will be destroyed; but the numerous Latin inscriptions of the names of knights in the refectory and elsewhere will be exposed to some risk. The chapel of the knights is being made into a prison for misdemeanants, and in order that they shall enjoy the comforts denied to felons, the stone flooring of the chapel has been taken up and replaced by a wooden one. On one of the blocks thus removed the following inscription is engraved:

Height 60 cm., width 49 cm. Letters Σ Μ Φ Υ Γ Ο.

- Ἐπὶ ἱεροποιοῦ Διοφάντου τοῦ Διοκλέους, ἐπὶ
πρυτανείας τῆς μετὰ Μητροδώρου τοῦ Λεοντι(ά)δου,
γραμματεῦντος Δράκοντος τοῦ Θεοδώρου, μῆνός
'Ανθεστηριώνος. Ἐδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
5 γνώμῃ πρυτάνεων· ἐπειδὴ Διόδωτος Φιλονίκου πάσα[ν
φιλοτιμίαν καὶ προθυμίαν παρέσχηται εἰς τὸ ἐπι-
σκευασθῆναι τὸ γυμνάσιον τὸ Φιλιππεῖον ἔμ μὲν [τ]ῷ[ι
πρώτῳ ψηφίσματι ἐπαγ[γ]ελάμενος εἰς τὰ ἔργα μὲ[ν
τῆς διπλῆς στόας δώσειν ἄτοκον δραχμὰς μυρίας καὶ τὸ
10 ἄλλαιπον κατὰ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας πᾶν, πάλι[ν] δὲ ἐν ἀλ[φ
ψηφίσματι φιλοτιμούμενος ὅπως ἂν ἅπαν ἡ συντετε-
λεσμένον τὸ γυμνάσιον τὰ προσδέοντα χρήματα
κατὰ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας δώσειν αὐτὸς πάντα ἄτοκα καὶ
διὰ ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας συμβέβηκεν ἅπαν το γυμνάσιον
15 ἐ]πεσκευάσθαι καὶ ἀποδεδείχασιν οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῇ βουλ[ῇ]
συντετελεσμένα πάντα τὰ ἔργα ἀρεστῶς καὶ δεδοκί-
μακεν ἡ βουλή, καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ φέρουσιν οἱ ἐπιμελη[τ]αι
εἰς τὰ ἔργα δεδοκότα Διόδωτον τὸ πᾶν ἄτοκον δραχμὰς
τριμυρίας τρισχιλίας τετρακοσίας, οὐ μόνον δὲ
20 αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν ἀλλὰ καὶ τινες τῶν δεδοκότων δώ[σ]ειν
ἔπεισεν· δεδόχθαι ὅπως ἂν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φανερός ἡ
τὸν εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον φιλοτιμηθέντα τιμῶν τιμ[ι]αῖς
ταῖς καταξίαις καὶ πάντες προτρέπωνται εἰς τοιαύτας χρ[ε]ίας
παρέχεσθαι εἰδότες τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ δήμου
25 στεφανῶσαι Διόδωτον Φιλονίκου χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ
καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκῇ ἀπὸ δραχμῶν τετρακισχιλίων
σ]τήσαι δὲ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ [γ]υ[μ]να[σ]ίῳ ἵνα
ὑ]πόμνημα ἡ τῆς φιλοτιμίας [ῆς] εἰς τὸ γ[υ]μ[ν]άσιον
παρέσχετο καὶ εἰς χρημάτων [λ]όγῳ[ν] ὑπὲρ τῶν . . .
30 ὧν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄλλα· ὅπως δ' ἂν [τὸ ἀργύριον
δοθῇ τὸ τε εἰς τὸν στ[έ]φανον [κ]αὶ τὴν εἰκόνα οἱ τάμιαι

ἐπειδὴ αἱ μὲν ἱερὰ καὶ δημόσ[ιαι] δαπάναι γέγονται
 ὁρῶντες δὲ
 Διόδοτον

(The rest is missing.)

Some of the readings in the last lines are a little doubtful, as the stone is much corroded here. In line 29 at the end I read ΥΠΕΓΓ on the stone, but the impression seems to establish ΥΠΕΡΤ. At the beginning of line 30 Ω is very doubtful. In line 32 the same may be said of ΔΗΜ. This is, I fancy, the only known decree of Halicarnassus dated by a ἱεροποιός. For a list of Halicarnassian decrees see Diehl and Cousin in *Bull. Hell.* xiv. p. 91 and Hirschfeld in *Inscr. of the B. M.* part iv. p. 55.

By the ψηφίσματα mentioned here we must understand decrees relating to the construction of the gymnasium not necessarily introduced by Diodotus, but having appended to them a list of subscribers of whom he was the chief. It would appear that two appeals for subscriptions were issued. In the first case Diodotus put himself down for 10,000 drachmas and also offered to pay up the subscriptions which were not forthcoming from the subscribers. In the second case he did not subscribe any definite amount, but renewed his former offer. He must have been a most popular man, for it is evident that had he any private and particular enemy, that enemy might have made himself very unpleasant to him by putting himself down for 100,000 drachmas and refusing to pay up. Possibly however in each case the appeal was for a stated amount. In line 20 I am not quite sure of the Ω.Ε at the end, but supposing them to be correct, we can only restore δώσεων, a tense, I fancy, unusual after πείθω.

On the left return of this stone is engraved:

ΝΙΚΗ
 ΝΕΩΝΟC
 ΤΟΥ
 ΚΟΡΡΑ
 ΝΙΚΗ
 /

This is yet another specimen of a class of graffiti which has been most recently discussed by Th. Reinach in the *Rev. des Études Grecques* vi. p. 197. I do not think that they have yet been satisfactorily explained, as no one has as yet brought under one point of view their two most characteristic qualities: (1) their geograph-

ical distribution—they are peculiar to Cos and the Carian coast; (2) the fact that they are almost invariably engraved on stones bearing previous inscriptions.¹

Two stones inscribed with ΝΙΚΗ followed by a proper name were found by me at Kos (*Inscr. of Cos*, Nos. 69, 70), and these, as I have there stated, are not graffiti at all but regularly engraved texts; and therefore I should suggest that the usage of this formula is derived from Cos. I would hence also venture the suggestion that all these inscriptions are to be regarded as prayers for good health. I should be grateful to any one who would add to the very slender support on which I have founded this hypothesis.

The right return of this stone has been covered with stucco, and some few traces of a Christian painted inscription remain.

(2) Fragment partially complete on the left, width 24 cm., height 14 cm., thickness 7 cm. recently found in the castle.

ΙΑΞΞΩΝΔΙΑΤΕΛ
 ΔΑΙΤΕΑΥΤΟΝΑΡΕΘΗ
 ΞΕΙΣΤΟΝΔΗΜΟΝΕΙΙ
 ΙΠΡΟΣΤΕΤΗΝΒΟΥΛΙ
 5 ΙΕΡΑΠΤΡΩΤΩΚΔΙΡΙ
 ΚΑΙΕΙΣΓΛΟΥ
 †

Part of a decree of earlier date than the last. We may restore

[. πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ π.]
 ράσσω διατελ[εῖ] περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐπηγῆσ-
 θαι τε αὐτὸν ἀρετῇ[ς] ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας
 τῇ[ς] εἰς τὸν δῆμον, εἶ[ναι] δὲ αὐτῷ πρόσο-
 δον[ος] πρὸς τε τὴν βουλ[ήν] καὶ τὸν δῆμον με-
 5 τὰ τὰ[ῖ]α ἐρὰ πρώτω(ι) κ(α)ὶ π
 καὶ εἰσπλου[ν] καὶ ἐκπλου[ν] κ.τ.λ.

In line 5 the Δ certainly comes closer in form to Δ than an Α, but is of course meant for the latter.

¹ This is true of all the examples of these graffiti known to me personally and from sources previous to Reinach, except Le Bas-Waddington, Nos. 366 and 503. Reinach publishes a number from Iasos engraved on drums of columns 'either separately or after previous inscriptions'; from which we may conjecture that those engraved 'separately' were cut on columns, other drums of which bore previous inscriptions.

W. R. PATON.

CALYMNOS, Feb. 11th, 1894.

Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik. Kunstgeschichtliche Untersuchungen von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER. With 140 illustrations in the text, and an atlas of 32 plates. Leipzig and Berlin. Giesecke and Devrient: 1893.

SECOND NOTICE.

3. *Kresilas*. In publishing the fine bust of Perikles (Brit. Mus.), now generally accepted as a copy of the famous portrait of Perikles by Kresilas, Furtwängler establishes certain stylistic criteria which enable him to claim for this artist a whole important series of monuments. This portrait bust—(that the original was really a bust seems proved by the shape of the inscribed basis found in 1888, Lolling *Delton Arch.* 1889, p. 36)—was put up, Furtwängler suggests, in B.C. 439 to commemorate the successful expedition of Perikles to Samos. He might have added, as further corroboration, that the enthusiasm roused by the Samian exploit found expression in another portrait,—for it must have been about the same time that Polykleitos executed the portrait of Artemon, one of the engineers of Perikles during the Samian war.

Controversy has been raging of late around the Diitrephes of Kresilas. Furtwängler shows that the Diitrephes mentioned on the Akropolis inscription that bears the name of Kresilas (Loewy *I.G.B.* 46) was not, as Pausanias supposed, the hero of the Mykalessian exploit, but an older Diitrephes, father of a certain Nikostratos—(who is mentioned by Thucydides as one of the generals at the beginning of the Peloponnesian wars); the epigraphical difficulties connected with the dating of the work are thus disposed of. By publishing as a copy of the Diitrephes the torso of the so-called Farnese gladiator at Naples (it agrees in every respect with the descriptions in Pausanias and Pliny, the *vulneratus deciens* being of course identical with the Diitrephes), Furtwängler puts an end to extravagant conjectures like those lately advanced by M. Six. Furtwängler shows finally and definitely, through her likeness to the Perikles, that the wounded Amazon¹ leaning on her spear (Michaelis' Capitoline type) was by Kresilas. In this connexion he discusses the existing material collected by Michaelis for the reconstruction of the Amazons, and in so doing brings to light

¹ According to F. the Perikles and the Amazon are about contemporary.

three important points: (1) that the Amazon of the Villa Doria is *not* a replica of the Polykleitan type, but a distinct fourth type which had hitherto passed unnoticed; (2) that the head placed upon the Petworth Amazon is foreign to the statue, and that therefore the head belonging to this type still has to be found; (3) that the Naples bronze head is *not* a replica of the head of the Polykleitan Amazon. The discovery of a fourth Amazon shows that archaeologists have perhaps been premature in doubting the story of the four Amazons told by Pliny. The Doria statue, from its likeness to the Polykleitan, betrays an Argive origin, and may therefore very well be the work of Phradmon. Furtwängler combats the theory that sees in the Petworth-Mattei type a mere adaptation of the Polykleitan; he points out the great originality of the conception (it is strange it should ever have been doubted) and does not hesitate to trace it back to Pheidias. He inclines to consider that we have a copy of the head of this Pheidian Amazon in the Naples bronze.

Furtwängler emphasizes the likeness (already noticed by Michaelis) between the Kresilaian Amazon and the superb *Pallas de Velletri* in the Louvre. The original of the Pallas may doubtless be safely attributed to Kresilas;—but it seems a trifle arbitrary to suppose that this original was an Athena Soteira possibly set up in the Peiraieus in the days of Perikles, and to try to prove that Pliny, through some disarrangement of his notes, came to put down under the name *Cephisodorus a Minervam mirabilem in portu Atheniensium*, that really belonged to *Kresilas*;—(poor Pliny! to what archaeological audacities has not your supposed untidy system of note-taking afforded a pretext?)

To the group of statues already reclaimed for Kresilas Furtwängler adds two of the grandest works in the Munich Glyptothek,—the Medusa Rondanini and the Diomedes. The original of the last-named statue has been placed by most critics in the fourth century,—some have even named Seilanian as the artist (Brunn, F. Winter). Furtwängler shows however, by comparison with other replicas, that certain fourth century traits in the Munich Diomedes are foreign to the original, and are due to the mannerism of one particular copyist. When once we have allowed for the admixture of foreign elements in the Munich replica, we must own with Furtwängler that, in its *essentials*, the Diomedes strongly resembles the works of Kresilas. On the ground of an inscription found at Hermione Furt-

wängler ingeniously contrives for Kresilas an Argive period, during which he supposes the artist to have executed the statue of the great Argive hero.

4. *Myron*. A discussion on the Riccardi head forms the natural link between Kresilas and Myron, for in this head Furtwängler detects the work of an artist who influenced and perhaps taught Kresilas; that artist was Myron. Indeed the affinities of the Riccardi head to the head of the Diomede are so patent that it is difficult to see why it should be put down to Myron rather than to Kresilas himself. If students of Italian art not unfrequently lend to Giorgione an early but *original* Titian, how much more liable to error is the Greek archaeologist who, with nothing but copies to deal with, has to decide between Myron and Kresilas! On the other hand Furtwängler is undoubtedly right in attributing to Myron the original of the Cassel Apollo with its replicas, and of the fine Perseus (Rome and Brit. Mus.), which Klein had already shown to be a work of the early fifth century. The original of the Perseus would according to the new theory be identical with the statue by Myron mentioned by both Pliny and Pausanias. Some idea of the whole composition may be formed from vases and from coins: the hero was represented with winged feet holding the sword in his left hand, the head of the Medusa in his right, and looking slightly away to the left. It is in presence of this Perseus, which was evidently the artistic prototype of the Diomede, that we understand how greatly Myron influenced Kresilas. Among other works reclaimed for Myron are the colossal head of a Herakles in the British Museum, the exquisite 'Asklepios' (Zeus Meilichios?) feeding his snake, of the Uffizi. Finally must be noted the tempting conjecture that in a head of the Museo Chiaramonti (Fig. 57), with its unmistakable Myronian touch, we have a copy, or at any rate an echo, of the Erechtheus set up at Athens and so greatly praised by Pausanias.

5. *Polykleitos*. The date proposed by Furtwängler for the activity of Polykleitos covers roughly the years B.C. 450—420. The Amazon, since it was made in competition with Kresilas, must be dated at about 440; the Doryphoros is evidently older and may therefore have been executed sometime towards 450. The third date we have for Polykleitos is B.C. 420, when he made the gold and ivory Hera for the temple of Argos. Thus Polykleitos would be a somewhat younger contemporary of Pheidias. These

results agree well with the express testimony of Plato in the *Protagoras* (311 C, 328 C). Tradition made Polykleitos also a pupil of Hagelaidas. The dates of the two artists do not permit us to accept this statement literally, but, as in the case of Pheidias, the tradition contains a general truth. In a fine critical passage Furtwängler dwells on the subtle changes by which Polykleitos modified the harsh canon of the old Argive masters. In the Ligorio bronze for instance, or in the Munich Zeus, where the left leg supports the weight of the body it is also the left arm that is bent at the elbow to hold some object, while on the right side where the leg is at ease the arm hangs down loosely. The effect produced by this tension of all one side of the body with the corresponding relaxation of the whole of the other side is unpleasant in the extreme. By an adroit interchange of the parts—by simply giving the spear into the left hand of his Doryphoros while placing the weight on the right leg—Polykleitos converted the ancient stiffness into a rhythmical softness. This crossing of the lines, this *chiasmos*, that first makes its appearance in art with the Doryphoros, is doubtless the secret of the popularity of Polykleitos with artists of subsequent ages; it is easy to trace in Furtwängler's pages the persistence of the Doryphoros type right down to the Mercury bronzes of Roman times.

A most desirable addition to our knowledge of the *Diadumenos* is made by the publication (Fig. 63) of the fine Madrid statue which, with its replicas, Furtwängler brings into the prominence it deserves. The Farnese *Diadumenos* is proved finally to belong to the Attic school—to Pheidias, and it was probably from it that Polykleitos borrowed the subject of his statue. The identification of the Kyniskos of Polykleitos with the Westmacott athlete (Br. Mus.) has been recently arrived at by Collignon, by Petersen and by Furtwängler; it is here worked out at length and with numerous illustrations (the charming head Fig. 73 has by the way recently passed from the Van Branteghem collection into the possession of Sir Edgar Vincent at Constantinople). Of the statues of Xenokles and of Pythokles (the inscribed bases have been found at Olympia), Furtwängler thinks he can detect copies in two statues of the Vatican. The beautiful bronze *Idolino* in Florence he claims to be an original from the school of Polykleitos—perhaps by his brother Patrokles. A Polykleitan statue from the Petworth collection, representing an athlete pouring oil from a

flask into his hand, is published on p. 465. Furtwängler shows well how the Argive Polykleitos or some pupil borrowed the motive from an Attic statue,—perhaps from the original¹ of the Munich 'oil-pourer'—and in this as in other instances made it his own by a change in the conception. This change exemplified in the Petworth athlete, in the Diadumenos, in the Amazon, consisted above all in the sacrifice of the Attic directness and singleness of purpose to the general grace of the composition, in the diversion of aim from simple expressiveness to an elegant *nonchalance*. Polykleitos, whom Furtwängler's investigations have shown to be so purely dependent upon his Attic predecessors for the subject and general conception of his statues, became in his turn,—perhaps because of a certain reactionary tendency in his art,—an important factor in the future development of the Attic school, as will be seen in the subsequent chapter.

6. *Skopas, Praxiteles, Euphranor*.—A fine and well preserved statue of Herakles (Lansdowne House), published on p. 516, Furtwängler shows to be still thoroughly Attic in conception, but in the handling of the nude he detects Polykleitan influences. The Lansdowne Herakles may be an early work of Skopas himself. As akin to it are noted *inter alia*: the beautiful Hermes of the Palatine (fig. 96), a bronze statuette of the young beardless Asklepios in Karlsruhe² (Fig. 95), a bronze statuette of Zeus (Fig. 94, Brit. Mus.). In most of these works an early Attic scheme has been modified by the introduction of Polykleitan motives; it is however one of Furtwängler's most subtle observations that the Argive influence so clearly detected in Skopasian works limits itself to the body, and never manifested itself, as had been supposed, in the treatment of the head. Into the elements which he adopted from his Attic or Argive models Skopas infused a spirit of restless energy, which marks him clearly as the forerunner of Lysippos. This characteristic makes itself strongly felt in those works where he indulged his love of broken contours (*gebrochene Umrisslinien*); thus it was he (and not Lysippos) who first transferred to the round a motive long popular in painting and relief, and represented a figure with one foot raised; this was the

attitude of the Apollo Smintheus (Strabo 13, p. 604); the analagous pose of a young Pan on coins of Heraea in Arkadia suggests that in this case also we have the reminiscence of a work by Skopas. Another system of 'broken lines' occurs in the Ares Ludovisi, in which in accordance with a very old conjecture Furtwängler sees a reduced copy of the *Mars sedens colossiaeus* of Skopas.³ Certain elements of restlessness which are combined with a distinctly Skopasian cast of feature in a charming Athena of the Palazzo Rospigliosi lead Furtwängler to conjecture that we have here a copy of the Athena made by Skopas to stand in front of the shrine of Ismene at Thebes; the original was probably bronze. The Ares together with the 'Meleager' (in which Furtwängler agrees with Graef in seeing a work of Skopas) betoken a change in the artist's technique. The well-defined system of planes observable in his earlier treatment of the nude now gives place to a system of rounded surfaces. This same round modelling is characteristic of the Hermes of Praxiteles, which Furtwängler accordingly assigns to the artist's third period, in opposition to the current view (Brunn's) that it was one of his early works.⁴ Professor Furtwängler finds a confirmation of his theory in the shape and material of the basis of the statue. The date of Praxiteles' first period is fixed by his close connexion with the little group of artists who, like Kephisodotos,⁵ Xenophon and Damophon, had a 'common historic background in the rise of Thebes, the supremacy of Boeotia, the emancipation of Arkadia, the rebuilding of Mantinea, the founding of Megalopolis, and finally the restoration of Messene.' In the artist's earlier period Furtwängler places the Satyr pouring wine into a cup (*i.e.* the *Periboëtos*), which formed a group with Dionysos and Methe on either side. Furtwängler suggests that it was perhaps a

³ A good replica of the head (identified last year by Prof. W. Klein) is in the Br. Mus.

⁴ F. agrees with S. Reinach and Purgold in thinking that the group of the Arkadian god Hermes nursing Dionysos the god of Elis, was intended to symbolize some treaty between Arkadia and Elis, but instead of referring it to about B.C. 363 after the troubles in the Altis, he suggests the treaty concluded in B.C. 343 between the Arkadians and the aristocratic party in Elis.

⁵ According to F. the elder brother, not the father of Praxiteles. His Eirene he connects with B.C. 375, when yearly offerings were instituted in honour of Eirene after the victories of Timotheus, and shows well that the statue by no means forms a transition from fifth to fourth century art; it is a conscious reaction towards Pheidian models.

¹ Attributed by F. to Lykios, the son of Myron. The original of a similar statue at Dresden he attributes to the school of Alkamenes.

² F. points out that a beardless Asklepios by Skopas is known from Paus. viii. 28. 1.

replica of this statue, executed by the master himself, that stood with a Dionysos and an Eros by Thymilos in the shrine of the street of the Tripods. A little later in the same period came the Eros of the Palatine (Louvre), a very charming statuette of Apollo (Louvre), now identified for the first time as Praxitelean, a Dionysos in Tarra-gona. He revives the theory of E. Q. Visconti that in the Eros of Centocelle (of which Furtwängler gives a list of replicas) we have a copy of the Eros of Thespiai. The sombre beauty of the young god suits the fourth century conception of him as ἀνάρτων δαμίων ἐπίπτατος, set in vogue by Euripides. The original stood between statues of Aphrodite and Phryne; of the goddess Furtwängler sees a copy in the Vénus d'Arles, of the Phryne we may have an echo in our own Townley Venus, though the actual statue from its advanced style Furtwängler judges to be a copy of the gilt portrait of herself which Phryne put up at a later period at Delphi, and which probably derived from the Thespian statue. Furtwängler further identifies one of the statues that stood next to the Delphian Phryne,—that of King Archidamos of Sparta,—in a bust from Herculaneum (published by Wolters *Röm. Mitth.* 1888, pl. iv.—but as Archidamos III.). The treatment of the head closely resembles that of the famous Euripides in Naples: Furtwängler inclines to refer both to the great master of Greek portraiture, Demetrios the ἀνθρωποποιός.

The Knidian Aphrodite with the Aphrodite of Kos (of which Furtwängler detects a copy in the Louvre) belong to the master's middle period; so do the Satyr at rest, and the Eubouleus. Lovers of Praxiteles and of this fine head will be glad to find that, in spite of the mass of controversy on the subject, Professor Furtwängler remains absolutely firm in his conviction that it is an original by Praxiteles.¹ Akin to the Eubouleus is a head in the Palazzo Pitti; it may be a copy of the Triptolemos of Praxiteles. The middle period—always according to Furtwängler—closes with statues like the Apollo Sauroktonos and the Eros of Parion (Louvre, 'Genius Borghese'). In the third period, and connected with the Hermes, came the Apollo resting his hand on his head, the kindred Dionysos ('Bacchus de Versailles'), a Dionysos in Madrid resting on a herm. The fine Hermes in the Uffizi raising a purse (purse and right hand are

modern restorations) Furtwängler claims for Praxiteles, together with a bearded Herakles in the Villa Albani, of which there is a variant in the Mus. Chiaramonti. Although Furtwängler reserves for later on his most startling discovery in regard to Praxiteles, it will be seen that we have here an essay equal in importance to that on Pheidias. It is early days yet to pass any judgment on the revolutionary chronology attempted for the works of Praxiteles. Every view put forward by Furtwängler is accompanied—one is tempted to say confirmed—by such a wealth of argument, that they demand the most serious consideration; yet Brunn's views cannot be lightly set aside, especially in cases where we are confronted by the difficulty that besets archaeologists at every turn, that of establishing any fair comparison between a mass of copies and one or two originals.

Of Euphranor of Corinth, sculptor and painter, tradition has left a considerable list of works, but we know little of his style except that the heads of his statues, according to Pliny or Pliny's informant, seemed too large for their bodies, in other words that he was 'pre-Lysippan.' Furtwängler identifies as copies after this master a whole series of works, which have certain characteristics in common with the great fourth century masters, and yet differ from them in the tenacity with which they reproduce the older canon of Polykleitos and even of Hagelaidas; among these works are a *Bonus Eventus* (cf. Plin. 34 § 77) on a gem in the Brit. Mus. strongly reminiscent of the *Idolino*, the Dionysos of Tivoli, an analogous bronze Apollo from Egypt (Br. Mus.), the Vatican 'Adonis' recalling the proportions observed by Hagelaidas, the Minerva Giustiniani, perhaps a copy after the *Minerva Catuliana* (Plin. 34 § 77), the Sambon Dionysos (bronze statuette, Louvre), the 'Elgin Eros' (Br. Mus.) and the beautiful head known as the 'Faun of Winckelmann' (Munich). The Paris of Euphranor Furtwängler sees in those statues wearing the Phrygian cap, which are generally interpreted as Ganymede or Attis, and of which there are numerous replicas.

7. *The Venus of Milo*.—Furtwängler's arguments on this important question can only be appreciated when read *in extenso*. The history of the discovery of the statue, the mass of evidence for and against the authenticity of the inscribed block discovered with it, the final mysterious disappearance of the block—form a curious episode in the history of archaeology. Furtwängler by exhibiting

¹ The beautiful photograph of this head lately published by Messrs. Braun should help the public to appreciate this view.

the facts of the case in a sober and scientific spirit, that has been too conspicuous by its absence whenever the famous Venus has been discussed, is able to prove that the long missing inscribed block with the name of [Age]sandros of Antioch on the Maiander does belong to the statue; the square hole in the block must consequently be a main factor in any attempt to recover the original motive of the statue. According to Furtwängler it was intended for the insertion of a square pillar on which the goddess rested her left arm. Equally important with this reconstruction (which will probably be accepted as final) is the date Furtwängler proposes for the statue. The foundation of Antioch on the Maiander in B.C. 256 gives us a *terminus ante quem*, but Furtwängler would bring the statue down to the first century B.C., when he believes that a great Renaissance of art took place. He finds a confirmation for this late date in the fact that the inscription is carved on a block which forms an integral part of the statue, a custom that first obtains in works of the latter half of the second century, such as the 'runner' by Agasias, and the Belvedere torso. The vigorous forward movement of the Venus is however not in harmony with the quiet motive of the arm resting on the pillar: the whole conception, according to Furtwängler, arose out of the *contaminatio* of two types; the artist, while partly copying the Aphrodite looking at herself in a shield which she holds on her raised left knee (Venus of Capua), replaced the motive of the shield by that of the pillar, in allusion perhaps to the Tyche of Melos, who on coins and bas-reliefs appears leaning on a pillar somewhat in the manner of the Aphrodite. Furtwängler has rendered good service in vindicating the greater originality and nobility of the Capuan statue as compared to the Melian. Its original, reproduced perhaps on Imperial coins of Corinth (*J.H.S.* 1885, pl. LIII. G. 121-6), Furtwängler would refer to Skopas;¹ a finer replica of the head (Pal. Gaetani) helps to this conclusion. This leads to a second essay on Skopas, in which Furtwängler proves two very celebrated statues, the Hypnos of Madrid (the Br. Mus. possesses a celebrated bronze replica of the head) and the Psyche of Capua (probably an Aphrodite), to be by this master.

¹ F. points out that here again Skopas would appear as the forerunner of Lysippos, the composition of the Eros stringing his bow being clearly derived from the Aphrodite with the shield.

8. *Apollo of the Belvedere*.—By publishing his arguments for thinking the Stroganoff bronze a mere modern forgery, Furtwängler disposes of the last argument that could compel one to place the original of the Belvedere statue as late as Alexandrian times: the Apollo who was represented as averter of evil, carrying the bow in his left hand and the laurel branch in his right, must, from his likeness to the Vatican Ganymede, be attributed (as Winter has well shown) to Leochares, another artist who is slowly emerging out of oblivion.² The artist of the Apollo adopted for his statue a type long current in Greek art, as is proved from the fine head of the god on the coinage of Amphipolis (about B.C. 430-370): Furtwängler conjectures that a head with distinctly Pheidian characteristics in the British Museum (labelled 'Alexander') must have belonged to a statue of this type—perhaps to a copy of the bronze *Parnopios* that stood on the Akropolis (Paus. i. 24. 8).³

The necessity for dwelling on what seemed the most important feature of the book, namely the reconstruction of fifth and fourth century *Meisterwerke*, compels me to pass over the final chapter, which is concerned with a number of questions connected with archaic art. The reconstruction of the throne of Apollo at Amyklæ must however be noted. Professor Furtwängler makes his throne clear by two fine drawings, which show the god standing on a sort of huge chair; the actual βάθρον of the image being formed by the altar over the ancient grave of Hyakinthos. On the rails that connected the legs of the throne, around the altar, and within twenty-seven panels on the back of the chair were disposed the subjects described at such length by Pausanias, and the distribution of which has constituted one of the worst archaeological puzzles.

This article must conclude with a word about the album of plates, which is a real treasure-house of *monumenti inediti*; a list of these is the best substitute for a summary, so desirable but so impossible, of the main portion of the book. Plates I. and II.

² To him F. attributes (with Koepf) the original of the Rondanini Alexander (Munich); as also the original of the Diane de Versailles, whose marked likeness to the Apollo has long been recognized.

³ F. has apparently made here another brilliant identification. He however a little spoils his theory, by seeing something beyond Pheidian forms in the head, i.e. a peculiar emotional character which makes him bring forward his Elder Praxiteles, and try to prove that in attributing the *Parnopios* to Pheidias Pausanias erred once again—*ne quid nimis!*

show the two Dresden replicas of the 'Lemnian'; the Bologna head is also reproduced by itself on Pl. III. On Pl. IV. are exhibited side by side two fifth century types of Athena: the first (from a Dresden cast of which the original has disappeared) resembles the Hope Athena at Deepdene, the other is from a replica of the Athena Farnese. In the Deepdene and Farnese types of Athena Furtwängler recognizes respectively the work of Pheidias and of Alkamenes. Two such statues, with a general likeness to one another might, as Furtwängler points out, have given rise to the anecdote told by Tzetzes (*Chil.* viii. 340); the story must have been current at an early date, for we have a trace of it in the *quo eodem tempore aemuli eius fuere Alkamenes...* of Pliny, which has given rise to so much discussion concerning the relations of Alkamenes to his illustrious master. It is to Alkamenes also that Furtwängler attributes the stately head of Aphrodite on pl. V. (Berlin); it bears a marked likeness to the 'Venus Genitrix.' The superb head of Ares on pl. VI. (Louvre), with the rich masses of hair escaping from the helmet, Furtwängler attributes to Pheidias; the seemingly analogous *Mars Borghese* he identifies as a copy of the Ares of Alkamenes. Pl. VII. reproduces the heads of the Monte Cavallo Dioscuri. On Pl. VIII. is given a fine head of Herakles (Berlin), which Furtwängler inclines to connect with a torso in the Louvre; the original of the statue he attributes to an artist of the school of Kalamis. Plates IX. to XVI. reproduce a series of Kresilaian works: the bust of Perikles (Brit. Mus.), the head of the Mattei Amazon, the Munich Diomede, the Dresden cast (from an original in England, that has now disappeared) of another replica of the Diomede, the Medusa Rondanini and the beautiful head of an athlete with a taenia round his head, from the Petworth collection. On Pl. XVII. we have the interesting Riccardi head. Myron is further represented by two heads of athletes on pls. XVIII. and XIX. (Berlin), by an interesting portrait from the Villa Albani (the so-called 'Peisistratos'), by a bearded head (of Poseidon?) at Berlin, and by the Perseus from Rome (the London replica is given in the text Fig. 55). A fine statue (Munich), probably a Zeus, published not long ago by Kékulé as Polykleitan, is given in Pl. XXIII; according to Furtwängler it is a work transitional from the school of Hagelaidas to that of Polykleitos. An important series of Polykleitan works ap-

pear on plates XXV. to XXVIII.: the head of a Diadumenos (Dresden), replica of the Madrid statue (which is published in the text); a superb statue of a boy (Dresden) showing the master's manner at a period when he was most influenced by Attic models; and finally two bronze statuettes. In one of these bronzes (Paris, Bibl. Nat.)—a figure wearing the turret crown symbolical of city guardianship—Furtwängler recognizes Aristaios, tutelary protector of Kyrene and of her silphion. The original work would be by some pupil or imitator of Polykleitos. The second bronze (Louvre) is a superb Greek original—from his immediate school, if not actually from his hand.¹ Plate XXIX. reproduces a Praxitelean Artemis at Dresden. On Plate XXX. we get the fine Skopasian Aphrodite from the Palazzo Gaetani, while in the Petworth Aphrodite on Plate XXXI. Furtwängler publishes another discovery he has made, equalling in importance that of the Lemnian Athena; it is his opinion that we have here an original from the hand of *Praxiteles*. The peculiarly living manner in which the growth of the hair is indicated alone betrays the actual touch of the master. The eyes have that mixed character of tenderness and vagueness which the ancient critic called *τὸ ὑπὸν* and the modern *lo sfumato*, an effect produced by a peculiar working of the under lid, which may be paralleled from the Hermes. Plate XXXII., finally, gives yet another discovery of the author's,—the bronze head of a boy, which by the help of staring porcelain eyes, long curls and a bodice draped after the fashion familiar 'in portraits of Queen Louise,' had passed for years as a modern bronze, and had accordingly been relegated to a work-room of the Berlin Museum. Deprived by Prof. Furtwängler of its modern embellishments, it proves to be a charming work of the same school which at a later date produced the famous *Spinario*.

I have already indicated that the *Meisterwerke* continues the great traditions of the

¹ There is in the Louvre another original bronze—the Beneventum head now published in the Brunn-Bruckmann *Denkmäler*—in which Furtwängler recognizes Polykleitan elements combined with certain traits reminiscent of the 'Lemnian.' Years ago he was the first to draw attention to this magnificent example of the purest Greek workmanship; two splendid heads of boys (Munich 302, and Naples, Rayet, *Monum.* ii. 67) he also pronounces in his present book to be Greek originals. These original bronzes are beginning to form a series which will certainly grow. Their value to our knowledge not only of ancient technique but of ancient athletic life can scarcely be overestimated.

schools of Winckelmann and of Brunn. At a time when, even in Germany, there seemed some danger lest archaeology should lose itself in special disciplines,—when, to use a homely proverb, archaeologists appeared unable to see the wood for the trees,—Furtwängler, by his width of range, by his grasp of the subject as a whole, by the skilful manner in which he makes every branch of archaeological specialization contribute to the main inquiry, has succeeded in recalling his science to its noblest function—that of the history of art. Whether Professor Furtwängler is offering some brilliant new solution of a problem, or whether with the conservatism of the true scholar he is defending the old views and resuscitating some theory of Visconti or of Winckelmann, he invariably brings into the field a mass of new material enabling him to impart to his arguments a force and a finality, in a word a quality of permanence, that marks his book as a standard work for years to come. I am reminded in conclusion of the sentence with which a scholar who combines to a rare degree erudition with subtlety of criticism greeted the book soon after its appearance: *Ce livre est le plus important qui ait encore paru sur l'histoire de l'art Grec*.¹ It is saying much but not too much.

* * I regret that owing to a misprint the approximate date of the Lemnian Athena is given in my first article as B.C. 440 instead of B.C. 450.

EUGÉNIE SELLERS.

March 1894.

THE EAST FRIEZE OF THE PARTHENON.

IN the absence both of direct evidence as to the meaning of the central group of the east frieze of the Parthenon, and of any conjectural solution which is in all respects satisfactory, it is perhaps unnecessary to apologize for attempting to add one to the numerous theories already propounded. That it is only a conjecture, and that it has in some of its details been anticipated, I am fully aware; but to the best of my knowledge the most important point in it is either new, or at least has not been considered by archaeologists within recent years.

The first question to be considered is:—What is the relation of the central group to

the procession represented on the frieze? Is it a part of that procession, which may be supposed to have arrived; or is it a group which is making preparations of some kind previous to the arrival of the procession?

This question is answered for us by the fact that the gods who are seated on either side of the central group appear to take no interest in what is there going on. Their faces are, with a few exceptions, turned away from the centre, and in the directions from which the procession is approaching. The exceptions only prove the rule, being dictated by a desire to avoid the monotony of a row of faces looking all in the same direction. Were the central group a part (in fact, the head) of the procession which has already arrived, this indifference of the deities would be inexplicable. Nor can it be supposed that the reason for their indifference is that the central group is within the temple and out of their sight; for where else can the deities themselves be supposed to be seated? To assume that the deities are seated outside the temple, while the ceremony which they are there to witness is to take place within it, seems altogether unreasonable. The central group then would seem certainly to be engaged in some arrangements preliminary to the ceremony which is to begin as soon as the procession arrives.

It follows from this that the garment with which the priest and boy are concerned cannot be the new peplos which is to be presented to the goddess—for that is being carried in the procession, which has not yet arrived at its destination; and, as already stated, it is in the highest degree unlikely that the gods should be so uninterested in the new peplos as to take absolutely no notice of it. That the garment in question is being folded up, not unfolded, is also against its being the new peplos, which ought presumably to be unfolded before putting it on the statue.

The theory which explains the garment as the himation of the priest, which he is laying aside previous to beginning the ceremony, has met with considerable opposition. In a recent paper (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, vol. xvi. part i.), the late Mr. Watkiss Lloyd takes up this theory in a modified form. The garment, he maintains, is the *protonion*, which was worn by the priest during the actual sacrifice. While this interpretation is in some ways more satisfactory than the older one, the expression *ἱματίδιον* used in Suidas to describe the *protonion* seems to

¹ S. Reinach in the *Revue Critique*, 5 fév. 1894.

point to a garment of a very different size to that which we have on the frieze.

From the great number of edges indicated in each fold, it would appear to be a very large piece of cloth, quite large enough to be carried, as was the peplos, in the form of a sail on a ship. But we have seen that the new peplos is out of the question. It remains—and this is so obvious a view that it will be surprising if it is now stated for the first time—that it must be the old peplos, which is to be replaced by the new one. Previous to the arrival of the procession, the priest has taken the old peplos off the statue, leaving it clothed only in the chiton which—whether a part of the original wooden statue, or a separate piece of drapery—was worn beneath the peplos. With the help of the boy, the priest is folding up the old garment to lay it aside.

It was objected to the 'himation theory' that the matter was too trivial to occupy the central point of the representation. This objection does not apply so strongly to Mr. Watkiss Lloyd's view; but still less will it hold against the present explanation, because the scene, as thus explained, is not a mere 'toilet-scene,' but intimately connected with the statue itself. At the same time, lest it should be felt that the action is still not important enough for the place it occupies, it may be well to point out that, provided the group was sufficiently decorative—a great deal is sacrificed to the decorative aspect of the frieze—and in some way suggested the main ceremony, the idea of dignity was not likely to weigh much with the artist. It is sufficient that the old peplos is there to suggest the new one. The representation of the latter as actually extended on the mast of a ship would, though picturesque, be evidently out of keeping with the frieze as a Greek artist would compose it; even the primitive statue of Athena herself is here avoided, although we know that, as at Phigaleia, the introduction of such an element was quite possible.

And if the image itself is absent, much more can we dispense with the new peplos, especially as it is partly represented and wholly suggested by the old one. It must not be forgotten that the main object of the frieze is to decorate the wall, and that consequently much may be omitted which in a realistic and logical presentation would have to be in evidence.

The meaning of the stools carried by the small female figures still remains unexplained. The last to discuss the subject is

Furtwängler, who believes that the stools are meant for the gods themselves. The only objection to this view is that the artist would hardly represent the gods as already comfortably seated, if they are expected immediately to remove to other seats. It is clear that this double set of seats for the same persons is unnecessary and inartistic. Under the circumstances, it is surely better to adhere to the safe, if somewhat vague, interpretation, that the seats are for some ceremonial purpose; or to assume that they are meant for the most important onlookers, for instance those men who take no actual part in the procession, but are represented, on either side of the seated gods, as awaiting its arrival. There is no reason to suppose that the worshippers were expected to stand during the whole ceremony, which would certainly occupy a considerable time.

The interpretation given above seems to me to be open to fewer objections than either the himation or new peplos interpretation; but far from claiming absolute certainty for all or any part of it, I merely offer it as a suggestion which may help to a final solution of the difficulty.

G. F. HILL.

PORTRAITS OF FAMOUS CITIZENS OF MYTILENE.

Αἰνέσωμεν δὴ ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους.

It is well known that the Imperial coinage of Mytilene presents a unique series of portraits of famous personages of that city.¹ On a rare coin in the French collection, PITTACUS appears, with ALCAEUS as the reverse type, while on other specimens representations of SAPPHO frequently occur. THEOPHANES of Mytilene, the historian and friend of Pompey, is portrayed,² as well as LESBONAX the Mytilenean philosopher and rhetorician. Lesbos appears both as a bearded philosopher and as a young Dionysos designated ΗΡΩC ΝΕΟC. Two por-

¹ See Head, *Historia numorum*, p. 488. These coins are well represented in the British Museum and will be photographed in the Museum Catalogue of the Coins of Lesbos that I am now engaged in preparing. The specimens in question are all of Imperial times, though they do not bear the names and heads of Emperors.

² On the obverse of coins of the time of Tiberius inscribed ΘΕΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΘΕΟC. The Archedamis—ΑΡΧΕΔΑΜΙC ΘΕΑ—of the reverse of these coins is unknown but is supposed to be the wife of Theophanes.

traits, bearing the names of a JULIA PROKLA (Procula), IOY . ΠΡΟΚΛΑΝ ΗΡΩΙΔΑ, and a FLAVIA NEIKOMACHIS, ΦΛΑ . ΝΕΙΚΟΜΑΧΙΣ, have been assumed hitherto to be those of persons otherwise unknown, and no one, so far as I am aware, has cited in this connexion the following inscription of Mytilene, copied by Cyriac of Ancona and edited by Kaibel in the *Ephemeris epigraphica* (ii. p. 7, no. i.):—
 Ἀ βόλλα καὶ ὁ δᾶμος Φλ. Πονηλικίαν Νεικομα[χ]ίδα....παῖδα Δωννομάχ[ω] καὶ Π[ρ]όκλ[α]ς τῶν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἀπὸ προγόνων εὐεργετῶν καὶ κτ[.]στᾶν τὰς πόλιος ἀμμείων τὰν δι' αἰῶνος πρίταν[ν] ἀρετᾶς εἰν[ν]εκα παῖδας.

We need not hesitate, I think, to identify the πρίτανις Flavia Publicia Neikomachis with the Flavia Neikomachis of the coins, nor is it rash to suppose that her mother Prokla is the Julia Prokla that we are in search of. Prokla and Neikomachis belonged to a family of Mytilenean εὐεργεταὶ and κτίσται, just as did Theophanes and Lesbionax, who on another inscription of Mytilene are honoured with the same epithets (Brit. Mus. *Inscript.* pt. ii. p. 47, no. ccxi.). The coins bearing the portrait of Prokla I should assign to the time of Faustina I. and those of Neikomachis to a slightly later period, for the first-named portrait resembles the head of the elder Faustina in features and in the style of the coiffure, while the second recalls the heads of Faustina the younger, Lucilla and Crispina. Prokla and Neikomachis cannot therefore be later than the Antonines, though of course they may possibly have lived at an earlier period. The obverse of one of the coins which shows the portrait of Neikomachis on the reverse consists of a bearded male head inscribed **ΣΕΞΤΟΝ ΗΡΩΑ**. This **SEXTUS** is unknown, but he may be conjectured to be the husband of Neikomachis.

On other coins of this series we find the portraits or the figures of a Dada, a Pankratides, a Nausikaa and a Leukippos. The legend **ΔΑΔΑ** is certain, though it has often been misread by numismatists. It accompanies a head resembling Matidia the niece of Trajan. The name DADA occurs in a passage of Nicolaus Damascenus (*frag.* 21 in C. Müller's *Frag. Hist. Graec.* iii. p. 370), in which a Dada is mentioned as the wife of Samon the Cretan who was associated with Skamander, first king of the Trojans. The story of this Dada appears to be Cretan, though it is at least curious that in connexion with it occurs the name of a locality

Πόλιον—which is possibly the Πόλιον ἐν Λέσβῳ τόπος of Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Πόλιον. The inscription **ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ** accompanies a young male head and also a standing figure resembling the youthful Asklepios. I take **PANKRATIDES** to be the name of a man (as in *C.I.G.* 1355) and not, as hitherto supposed, a name of the god Asklepios. Mr. Head has suggested to me that Pankratides may have been a Mytilenean physician who is here represented—after his death—in the character of the God of Healing. As Pankratides occurs on the coins of Dada, it may be presumed that he was related to her or was at any rate a contemporary. The bust of **ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ** appears on a coin of the time of Faustina the elder with the inscription **ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑΝ ΗΡΩΙΔΑ**. Doubtless, some Mytilenean lady is here represented and not the Nausikaa of Homer.

Lastly, the legend **ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΟΣ** accompanies a standing male figure who (so far as the British Museum coin can be made out) appears to be a philosopher. It is not known however that the celebrated philosopher **LEUKIPPOS** was in any way connected with Mytilene. A Leukippos occurs in the legendary history of Mytilene (Diod. v. 81). It will be seen that this curious gallery of Lesbian worthies demands still further study: meanwhile, I may perhaps claim to have somewhat reduced the number of its unknown portraits.

WARWICK WROTH.

DISCOVERIES OF ROMAN REMAINS IN BRITAIN.—II.

THE first place among recent discoveries of Romano-British remains must be given to those made on the Wall. Dr. Hodgkin and other Northumbrian antiquaries have been promoting some very valuable excavations into the curious Vallum which runs closely parallel to the Wall for the greater part of its length. The sections cut through this earthwork have already revealed some new facts. At Heddon it was shown pretty certainly that the ditch and its northern and southern mounds were made at the same time, and thus all the theories, however ingenious, which explain the Vallum as a composite work, constructed at various times, are put out of court. At Down Hill, a road seventeen feet wide, with a clay foundation and a sandstone pitching, was

discovered running parallel to the Wall and crossing the Vallum. This is a most important result, if (as seems most probable) this road is the Roman communication road along the Wall. The inference is obvious: the Wall and its appendages were made and used at a time when the Vallum was no longer in use, or, in other words, the Vallum is earlier than the Wall. Some antiquaries, like myself, had previously approached this conclusion by other arguments and we can only hope that further excavation will confirm the view suggested by the sections at Down Hill. Hitherto, it had been usually believed that the Vallum was the rear defence of the Wall, and this theory, ardently advocated by Dr. Bruce, received the sanction of Prof. Hübner. The eminent German scholar has, however, as I believe, never traversed the Vallum, and I cannot think that any one who looks at the earthworks can suppose them to be intended for defensive purposes or for any military object whatever. It is much to be hoped that Dr. Hodgkin and his colleagues which they have so well begun, and that they will receive bounteous measure of both local and of learned support.

Apart from the excavations of the Vallum, the finds to be recorded are almost wholly epigraphic. A large hoard of coins, probably of the third century, found near Fordingbridge, and fragments of the Roman city wall at Rochester are, I think, the only exceptions.

The inscriptions are as follows:—

(1) A tombstone found at Chester, *Q. Domitius Q. filius) Claudia tribu) Optatus Viruno...* doubtless one of the Chester garrison.

(2) A 'milestone' found (it is thought near Neath) and now in the Cardiff museum, [*Imp] C(a)es. [D]io[c]leti[a]no [A]ug.,* which may be put beside another 'milestone' of Diocletian found in the same district long since.

(3) A tile found by Mr. John Bellows among the foundations of a large Roman building near the centre of Glevum (Gloucester) and inscribed R. P. G., probably *Respublica Glevensium*. Glevum received colonial rank pretty certainly under Nerva.

(4) A dedication found at Carlisle, *Deo Marti Ocelo et Numini Imperatoris Alexandri Aug et Iul[ia]e Mamaeae ... totique] dom[ui] divinae...*, in which the names of Alexander and his mother have, as often, been erased. Ocelus appears to be an unknown epithet of Mars: it is, of course,

non-Roman like Belatucader and Cocidius. Some other inscriptions found along the eastern half of the Wall are of less interest.

I may take this opportunity of correcting a mistake made in my first article (*C.R.* vii. 431). I there spoke of excavations in Annandale as confirming the idea that a Roman road ran from Carlisle past Birrens to the Wall of Antonine. I learn from Dr. James Macdonald, one of the excavators, that the results of their work were at first wrongly reported and that, in his opinion, no Roman road was found. I may here draw attention to a paper by the same antiquary, read to the Scotch Society of Antiquaries, which demolishes a supposed road in Ayrshire and shows the ease with which such roads are foisted on to our maps.

F. HAVERFIELD.

GRAMMAR OF THE LOTUS (1891).

MR. GOODYEAR in his valuable and complete *Grammar of the Lotus* appears to regard it as a still unanswered question why the lotus was regarded as a sun symbol, but surely the reason is not far to seek. He has proved that the lotus is of the genus *Nymphaea*, and the flowers of this genus may be said to follow the sun in his underworld journey since they dip under water at sunset and raise themselves from it at sunrise.

The fact was undoubtedly known in ancient times. Theophrastus describes the phenomenon in the case of the Egyptian lotus and gives special particulars of the lotus of the Euphrates: he says,—ἐν δὲ τῷ Εὐφράτῃ τὴν κωδύαν φασὶ καὶ τὰ ἄνθη δύνειν καὶ ὑποκαταβαίνειν τῆς ὀψίας μέχρι μεσῶν νυκτῶν καὶ τῷ βάθει πόρρω οὐδὲ γὰρ καθιέντα τὴν χεῖρα λαβεῖν εἶναι. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὅταν ὄρθρος ᾖ πάλιν ἐπανέιναι καὶ πρὸς ἡμέραν ἐπὶ μᾶλλον ἅμα τῷ ἡλίῳ φανερόν ὃν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ ἀνοίγειν τὸ ἄνθος, ἀνοιχθέντος δὲ ἐπὶ ἀναβαίνειν συχρὸν δὲ τὸ ὑπεραίρον εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ. *Hist. plant.* iv. 8–10.

While this has been observed in the case of many other species of the genus *Nymphaea* it does not seem to have been recorded of *Nymphaea Stellata*, the blue water-lily of tropical Africa which by its colour and outline strongly suggests the lotus of Egyptian art. A series of observations which I made last August at Kew Gardens have enabled me to state the fact for this species also.

At 3 p.m. the flower-stalks were vertical, an hour later they were inclined at an angle of about 45°: the movement seemed due to loss of tension in the stem and the weight of the large flower. Two visibly moved with jerks and slips till by 5 o'clock nothing but falling on a floating leaf prevented them from being half submerged.

CONSTANCE GARLICK.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Kreimbach in dem Pfalz.—The excavations begun in September last have been carried on, with somewhat similar results; also the find of iron tools and weapons (mentioned in vol. vii. p. 479) has been thoroughly investigated and classified, the chief result being to show that in many cases they differ but little from those now in use. They appear to belong to the third and fourth centuries after Christ. The excavations brought to light yet more foundations, together with architectural fragments, and more iron tools. An interesting capital of sandstone decorated with a pattern of scales, large bronzes of Constantine, Theodosius, and Honorius, bronze and glass ornaments, may also be mentioned.¹

SICILY.

Syracuse.—Near the railway station the long missing Roman aqueduct has been discovered, though its source has not as yet been traced. Its existence had been known for some time, but it is only recently that a considerable portion of the arches has come to light.²

GREECE.

Athens.—Dörpfeld has reported on the results of his excavations during the winter in search of the spring of Enneakrounos. The aqueduct leading to it appears to have been built like that of Eupalinus in Samos, and followed the ancient road leading to the Akropolis, while below the reservoir into which the aqueduct of Peisistratos emptied itself, another later reservoir was constructed for the water flowing from the slopes, of the Hill of the Nymphs, to convey it to the Agora. Several archaeological objects of value were found, including a relief of the Phrygian god Men, who was worshipped as a divinity in connection with water and rain. Two heads, both portraits of the same person, known to us from other remains but as yet unidentified, and two small figures, a Nike in alabaster and a man fighting a lion in crystal, were also brought to light.

The work of enclosing the Dipylon cemetery has begun, and at the first clearing of the soil at a very small depth was discovered a subterranean water-course. It is thought to be the ancient Eridanus, vestiges of which have already been identified during the past year in other parts of the city.³

H. B. WALTERS.

Athenische Mittheilungen. Part iii. 1893.

1. Studniczka proposes a new reading for the famous inscription engraved on the Dipylon vase,

¹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 7 April 1894.

² *Athenaeum*, 7 April 1894.

³ *Ibid.* 17 March 1894.

probably the oldest existing Attic inscription (*ante* 1881, p. 106 etc.): according to his view, the vase is a prize, probably given at a Dionysiac festival. 2. Körte: describes the tamenos of a god of healing discovered in the Enneakrounos excavations: with an account of various inscribed votive reliefs etc. found there: one inscription describes the setting up of the shrine in the archonship of [probably Astyphillos, B.C. 420]. 3. Kern: publishes eleven inscriptions of Thasos, copied in a recent journey in the island. 4. The same: eight inscriptions from Miletos. 5. Maass: proposes a new reading of the Rhea epigram from Phaistos (*Mus. Ital.* iii. p. 736). 6. Milchhöfer: discusses Löper's views on the Trittyes and demes of Attica (*ante* 1892, p. 319), treating the ten tribes in detail. 7. Noack: disputes the explanation given by Benndorf of the two friezes of the W. wall at Gjöbaschi: he thinks there is no evidence sufficient to indicate that they are scenes from the Trojan War: possibly they may be local Lycian subjects. 8. Von Gaertringen: two inscriptions from Nysa. 9. Kern: inscription from Athos.

The same. Part iv. 1893.

1. Kern: studies in Samothrace, carrying on the record of discoveries in the island from the year 1875 (the date of the last Austrian expedition) to the present time: one very interesting inscription records the importation by Hippomedon about 240 B.C. of troops and war material, to protect the island either against Macedonians or pirates. 2. Von Gaertringen: collects the inscriptions from Rhodes and Karpathos which bear on the Samothracian cults. 3. Humann: gives an account of some tentative excavations made in October 1888 on the site of Tralles: the most important results were in connection with the theatre, of which Dörpfeld gives (pp. 404—13) a description: an interesting peculiarity of this is the T-shaped underground canal running under the centre of the orchestra, similar to those found at Eretria and Magnesia, and clearly intended as a mode of access for persons: the building supported on columns is not a logeion but a proskenion: with plan. 4. Brückner: publishes (pl. xiv.) a bronze tripod and urn, found in 1883 at Athens with vases of the Dipylon style. 5. Moritmann: inscriptions from Edessa.

Römische Mittheilungen. Part iii. 1893.

1. Michaelis: publishes an outline drawing of the relief of the so-called Ara of Kleomenes in the Uffizi: and compares it with the Naples Orpheus relief: the figures on the left and right have been added to the original central group. 2. Erman: the obelisks of Roman time in Italy: (1) the obelisks of Beneventum. 3. Patsch: studies the inscriptions referring to the garrison of Praeneste, in reference to Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 46. 4. Samter: publishes an inscribed altar in the Vatican, with a relief representing Mercury and Maia. 5. Petersen: publishes part of a small disk of iron with figures in relief: the subject is a Gigantomachia, which was based on a picture influenced by the Pergamene frieze and in part derived from the shield of Athene Parthenos: probably it was the ornament of a shield. 6. Graeven: publishes a list of sculptures given in the Codice Barberiniano xxxix. 72, and belonging in the sixteenth century to the brothers della Porta: with conjectures as to identification. 7. Bulle: publishes a group found in Rome representing Dirke and the bull: the type chosen is that of the Farnese group, which shows not the actual binding, but the moment immediately before the catastrophe.

The same. Part iv. 1893.

1. Petersen : discusses (in reference to *Arch. Jahrb.* 1893, p. 119) the question whether the Farnese dead Amazon had an infant at her side : such a figure is given in the memoir of Bellièvre and others, but the infant really belonged to some other group. 2. Hülsen : fourth yearly report on new discoveries and

researches in the topography of Rome, 1892 (pp. 259—325). Report of discoveries. Descriptions of (1) the collection of Cav. Pascale near S. Maria di Capua : consisting chiefly of bronzes, and painted vases : (2) antiquities of the Marchese Chigi at Siena, pottery and sculpture (Petersen).

C. S.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aby* (F.) Geschichte der römischen Literatur. 8vo. Berlin, Gaertner. 7 Mk.
- Aeschylus.* Wecklein (N.) Studien zu den Hekiden des Aeschylus. I. Die Danaïdensage. Ak. München 94. 58 S. 8vo.
- Albrecht* (E.) Zur Vereinfachung der griechischen Schulgrammatik. Progr. 4to. Berlin.
- Apuleius.* Mele (Salv.) Apuleio e l'asino d'oro. Saggio critico. 16mo. Torino, Clausen. 2 l.
- Aristaeneta.* Soergel (H.) Glossae Aristaenetae. Diss. 8vo. Erlangen.
- Augustini* (S. Aur.) De Genesi ad litteram libri xii. ; eiusdem libri capitula ; de Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber ; locutionum in Heptateuchum libri vii. Rec. Jos. Zycha. (Corpus scriptorum eccl. lat. Vol. XXVIII.) 8vo. Vienna, Temp-sky. 16 M. 80 Pf.
- Avianus.* Heidenhain (F.) Zu den Apologi Aviani. Progr. 4to. Strasburg.
- Becker* (H.) Zur Alexandersage. Alexanders Brief über die Wunder Indiens. Progr. 4to. Königsberg.
- Beschreibung der antiken Münzen in den Kön. Museen zu Berlin. Band III. Abtheil. I. Italien. Aes rude, Aes signatum, Aes grave. Die geprägten Münzen von Etrurien bis Calabrien (von H. Dressel). 12mo. Berlin, Spemann. 27 Mk. 50 Pf.
- Bibliotheca philologica.* Jahrg. XLVI. Heft 3, 4. 8vo. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & R. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.
- Bruns* (Dr. Ivo.) Die griechischen Tragödien als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle. Rede. 8vo. Kiel, Universitäts-Buchh. 1 Mk.
- Catonis* (M. Porci.) De agricultura liber. M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri III. ex rec. H. Keilii. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Commentarii in Catonis de agricultura librum. 8vo. Lipsiae, Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Cicero's Verrines.* M. T. Ciceronis in C. Verrem orationes. Divinatio in Q. Caecilium et actionis secundae. Libri IV. et V. De signis et de suppliciis. Texte latin, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction générale et un index détaillé par E. Thomas. Nouvelle édition. 8vo. Paris, Hachette. 8 fr.
- Cicero.* Ströbel (E.) Die Handschriften zu Ciceros Rede in Pisonem. Progr. 8vo. Nürnberg.
- Commentationes philologiae Ienenses, ediderunt Seminarium Philologorum Ienensis Professores. Vol. V. (Finis.) 8vo. Lipsiae, Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Constantinus Porphyrog.* Büttner-Wobst. Der Codex Peirescianus. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Excerpte des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos. 8vo. Leipzig.
- David* (J.) Hermeneumata Vaticana emendata et illustrata. Diss. 8vo. Jena.
- Decker* (F.) Die griechische Helena im Mythos und Epos. Progr. 4to. Magdeburg.
- Dictys Cret.* Brunnert (G.) Sprachgebrauch des Dictys Cretensis. I. Syntax. Progr. 4to. Erfurt.
- Dornheim.* Zur Anschaulichkeit im lateinischen Anfangsunterricht. Progr. 4to. Seehausen.
- Firmici Materni (Iulii) Matheseos libri VIII. Primum rec. Car. Sittl. Pars I. Libri I.—IV. 12mo. Lipsiae, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.
- Fuchs* (Jos.) Der 2e punische Krieg und seine Quellen, Polybius und Livius, nach strategisch-taktischen Gesichtspunkten beleuchtet. Die Jahre 219 und 218 mit Ausschluss des Alpenüberganges. Ein Versuch. 8vo. Wiener, Neustadt, Blumrich. 2 Mk.
- Graf* (Dr. E.) Die Theorie der Akustik im griechischen Altertum. Progr. 4to. Gumbinnen. 1 Mk.
- Gsell* (H.) Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitian. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Fr. Fasc. LXV.) 8vo. Paris, Thorin. 12 fr.
- Hagen* (T. v.) Erklärung und Kritik einiger Stellen aus griechischen Schriftstellern. Progr. 4to. Sangerhausen.
- Havet* (L.) Abrégé de métrique grecque et latine. 12mo. Paris, Delagrave.
- Heron of Alex.* Schmidt (W.) Das Proemium der Pneumatik des Heron von Alexandria in lateinischer Uebersetzung. Aus einer Münchener und zwei Mailänder Handschriften herausgegeben. Progr. 4to. Braunschweig.
- Herondas.* Mimiamben, Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit erklärenden Bemerkungen von S. Mekler. 8vo. Vienna, Konegen. 1 Mk. 60 Pf.
- Les Mimes. Traduction française, précédée d'une introduction par G. Dalmeyda. 2d Edition. 8vo. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr.
- Hesiod.* Leo (Fried.) Hesioda. Progr. Royal 8vo. Göttingen, Dieterich. 50 Pf.
- Hoffmann* (M.) Zur Erinnerung an August Boeckh. Progr. 4to. Lübeck.
- Hölzl* (M.) Bedeutung und Gebrauch des Wortes actio bei den lateinischen Schriftstellern. Progr. Dresden.
- Homer.* Ludwich (A.) Batrachomachiae Homericae Archetypon ad fidem codicum antiquissimorum restitutum. Progr. 4to. Königsberg.
- Horace.* Henke (O.) Lehrplan für die Lektüre des Horaz, nebst einer kurzgefassten Metrik für Primaner. Progr. 4to. Bremen.
- Isidorus Hisp.* Gropius (R.) Das Verhältnis des Codex Weiburgensis No. 3 der Etymologiae des Isidorus Hispalensis zu den Bernenses 101, 224, 36 und 291. Progr. 4to. Weiburg.

- Isocrates.* Reuss (Dr. Fr.) Isokrates Panegyricus und der Kyprische Krieg. Progr. 4to. Trarbach. 80 Pf.
- Job* (L.) Le présent et ses dérivés dans la conjugaison latine d'après les données de la grammaire comparée des langues Indo-Européennes. 8vo. Paris, Bouillon. 10 fr.
- Kretschmer* (P.) Die griechischen Vaseninschriften, ihrer Sprache nach untersucht. 8vo. viii, 251 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann. Mk. 5.50.
- Kokulé* (R.) Über eine weibliche Gewandstatue aus der Werkstatt der Parthenongiebelfiguren. With 6 illustrations and 4 photolith. plates. Fol. Berlin, Spemann. 10 Mk.
- Koch* (E.) De Atheniensium logistis euthynis synegoris. Progr. 4to. Zittau.
- Krumbacher* (K.) Mittelgriechische Sprichwörter. 8vo. 272 pp. München.
- Kulturbilder aus dem klassischen Altertume VI. Schluss. 12mo. Leipzig, Seemann. Each 3 Mk. [Contents: Opitz, R. Das häusliche Leben der Griechen und Römer. vii, 302 pp. Illustrations.]
- Kuriakides*, Γ., Θάμης ὁ Μαρτύριος καὶ Ἰσοκράτης. Diss. 8vo. 106 pp. Erlangen.
- Kurmiotis* (K.) Herakles mit Halios geron und Triton auf Werken der älteren griechischen Kunst. Diss. 8vo. Munich.
- Lafaye* (G.) Catulle et ses modèles. 8vo. xi, 257 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co.
- Langen* (P.) Quaestionum ad Valerium Flaccum spectantium part. I. Progr. 4to. 10 pp. Münster 94. 10 S. 4to.
- Leeuwen* (J. F. van.) Enchiridion dictionis epicae Pars posterior. 8vo. Leyden, Sijthoff. 8 Mk. 25 Pf.
- Lucian.* Bieler (Joh.) Ueber die Echtheit der Lucianischen Schrift De Saltatione. Progr. 8vo. Wilhelmshafen. 80 Pf.
- Ludevig* (A.) Schliemanns Ausgrabungen und die Homerische Cultur. Progr. 8vo. 50 pp. Plan. Feldkirch.
- Luetke* (C.) Pherecydea. Dissertatio. 8vo. 64 pp. Göttingen. Dieterich's Verlag. Mk. 1.20.
- Malchin* (F.) De auctoribus quibusdam qui Posidonii libros meteorologicos adhibuerunt. Diss. 8vo. 57 pp. Rostock.
- Maass* (E.) Commentatio mythographica. II. Progr. 4to. 16 pp. Greifswald.
- Μηνόπουλος* (Θ.) 'Εναλσίμος διατριβή περί σοφίστων ἐπὶ τε παραβολῇ παραλλήλων Δημοσθένου καὶ Ἱερρίου καὶ Ἀριστέιδου τοῦ σοφίστου καὶ ἐπὶ διδακτορικῇ ἀναρρήσει. 8vo. Diss. Erlangen.
- Mentz* (M.) De magistratuum Romanorum Graecis appellationibus. Diss. 8vo. Jena.
- Mitteilungen über römische Funde in Hedderneim. I. 4to. vii, 50 pp. Illustrations. 4 plates. Frankfurt-a-m. Völcker. 4 Mk.
- Mommsen* (Th.) Le droit public romain. Traduit sur la 3e édition allemande par Fr. Girard. Vol. IV. 8vo. Paris, Thorin. 10 fr.
- Forms Vol. IV. of Mommsen et Marquardt, Manuel des antiquités romaines.
- Nerrlich* (Dr. P.) Das Dogma vom klassischen Altertum in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. 8vo. Leipzig, Hirschfeld. 7 Mk. 50 Pf.
- Niese* (B.) Josephi epitome adhuc inedita pars VII. Progr. Marburg 94. 25 S. 4to.
- Oberdieck* (J.) Studien zur lateinischen Orthographie. IV. Progr. 4to. Breslau.
- Oppenraay* (R. v.) Libri de Republica Atheniensium CC. I.—IV. Diss. 12mo. 115 pp. Leiden.
- Ouvré* (H.) Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiadem, Posidippum, Hedyllum, Thése. 8vo. Paris, Hachette.
- Ovid.* Peters (K.) Schulwörterbuch zu Ovids sämtlichen Dichtungen. 8vo. Gotha, Perthes. 2 Mk. 50 Pf.
- Pausanias.* Heberdey (Rud.) Die Reisen des Pausanias (Abhandlungen des archaeolog.-epigraph. Seminars der Universität Wien. Heft 10). 8vo. Vienna, Tempsky. 10 Mk.
- Petreas* (S. M.) 'Η Μάνηται ὁ βίος τῶν Μανιατῶν ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὰ παρ' Ἀρχαίων. Diss. 8vo. 32 pp. Erlangen.
- Pindar.* Reinhold (H.) Griechische Oertlichkeiten bei Pindaros. 4to. Quedlinburg. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Planus.* Rhodius (A.) De syntaxi Planciana. Progr. 4to. Bautzen.
- Plato.* Boetticher (C.) Eros und Erkenntnis bei Plato in ihrer gegenseitigen Förderung und Ergänzung. Progr. 4to. Berlin.
- Platonis Apologia. In scholarum usum denuo ed. M. Schanz. 8vo. Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 60 Pf.
- Sammlung ausgewählter Dialoge mit deutschem Kommentar, von M. Schanz. III. Apologia. 8vo. Ibid. 3 Mk.
- Pliny.* Renjes (L.) De ratione quae inter Plinii naturalis historiae librum XVI et Theophrasti libros de plantis intercedit. Diss. 8vo. Rostock.
- Schlottmann (W.) De auctoribus quibusdam in Plini naturalis historiae libro XVIII. Diss. 8vo. Rostock.
- Plutarch.* Schlemm (A.) De fontibus Plutarchi commentationum de audiendis poetis et de fortuna. Diss. 8vo. Göttingen. 2 Mk.
- Popp* (E.) De Ciceronis de officiis librorum codicibus Vossiano Q. 71 et Parisino 6601. Progr. 12mo. 20 pp.
- Regnaud* (P.) Les premières formes de la religion et de la tradition dans l'Inde et la Grèce. 8vo. Paris, Leroux. 10 fr.
- Reinkens* (J. M.) Berechtigung und Ziel des griechischen Unterrichts. 4to. Leipzig. 80 Pf.
- Rhetores graeci ex rec. Leon. Spengel. Vol. I. Pars II. Ed. C. Hammer. 12mo. Lipsiae, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60 Pf.
- Ringwald* (H. F. Th.) De exercitiis Lacedaemoniorum. Diss. 12mo. viii, 64 pp. Leuwarden.
- Rodocanachi* (E.) Les corporations ouvrières à Rome depuis la chute de l'empire romain. 2 vols. 4to. With plain and coloured engravings. Paris, Picard.
- Roegholl* (L. P.) Ps. Lysiae oratio contra Andocidem. Diss. 12mo. viii, 56 pp. Groningen.
- Sallustii Crispi* (C.) Bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum, orationes et epistulae ex historiis excerptae. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Th. Opitz. I. Bellum Catilinae. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 60 Pf.
- Felke (V.) De Sallustii Catilina. 8vo. Münster.
- Schäfer* (P.) Das Particp des Aoristes bei den Tragikern. Diss. 4to. 18 pp. Erlangen.
- Scherrans* (W.) De poetarum comicorum atticorum studiis Homericis. Diss. 12mo. 57 pp. Königsberg.
- Schlemm* (A.) De fontibus Plutarchi commentationum de audiendis poetis et de fortuna. Diss. 12mo. 102 pp. Göttingen.
- Schmidt* (W.) De Flavio Josepho elocutiones criticae. Pars I. Diss. 12mo. 48 pp. Göttingen.
- Schneider* (R.) Excerptum περί διαλέκτων. E codicibus Baroccianis LXXII et CIII bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis editum. Progr. 8vo. Duisburg.
- Schoene* (A.) Conjectanea critica. Progr. 4to. 16 pp. Kiel, Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1 Mk. 50.

- Schrader* (J.) *Palaephatea*. 8vo. 60 pp. Berlin, Heinrich. 1 Mk. 60.
[Abhandlungen (Berliner) zur klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft. Band I. 1.]
- *Palaephatea*. (I.) Diss. 12mo. 33 pp. Berlin.
- Schulze* (W.) *Orthographica*. Progr. 4to. Marburg.
- Seneca*. Müller (Joh.) Kritische Studien zu den *Naturales quaestiones Senecas*. (Extr. from Sitzungsberichte). 8vo. Vienna, Tempsky. 80 Pf.
- Sittl* (C.) *Parerga zur alten Kunstgeschichte*. I. Was ist Schliemanns Troja? II. Die Kypseloslade. III. Der Talo incessens des Polyklet. IV. Zum Myrronischen Marsyas. 4to. 30 pp. Würzburg.
- Sophocles*. *Electra*. Expliquée littéralement et annotée par Benloew et traduite en français par Bellaguet, 16mo. 225 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 3 fr.
- Büchner (Dr. W.) Ueber den Aias des Sophocles. Progr. 4to. Offenbach. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Stein* (P.) Zur Geschichte der Piraterie im Altertum. II. Progr. 4to. Bernburg.
- Stern* (E.) Zur Entstehung und ursprünglichen Bedeutung des Ephorats in Sparta. 8vo. v, 62 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 2 Mk.
[Berliner Studien für Class. Philologie. Band 15. Heft 2.]
- Strabo*. Stemplinger (E.) Strabons litterarhistorische Notizen. I. Diss. 8vo. München.
- Terence*. Karsten (H. T.) Terentiani prologi quot qualesque fuerint et quibus fabularum actionibus destinati a poeta. (Extr. from Mnemosyne). 8vo. Leiden, Brill. 1 Mk. 25 Pf.
- Ter-Mkrtschian* (K.) Die griechischen Quellen über die Paulikianer. Diss. 12mo. 40 pp. Leipzig.
- Thalheim* (Th.) Zu den griechischen Rechtsaltertümern. II. Progr. 4to. Hirschberg.
- Thucydides*. Ausgewählte Abschnitte für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von Chr. Harder. 2 Parts. 8vo. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk. 60 Pf.
- Tomaschek* (W.) Die alten Thraker. II. Die Sprachreste. Hälfte I. Glossen aller Art und Götternamen. 8vo. 70 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 1 Mk. 40.
[Extract: Sitzungsber. d. K. Akad. der Wissenschaften].
- Ulrich* (J. B.) De Salviani scripturae sacrae versionibus. Progr. 12mo. 52 pp. Neustadt.
- Valerius Flaccus*. Koesters (H.) Quaestiones metricae et prosodicae ad Valerium Flaccum pertinentes. Diss. 8vo. Münster. 2 Mk.
- Valmaggi* (L.) Manuale storico-bibliografico di filologia classica. 8vo. Torino, Clausen. 8 l.
- Vermaat* (H.) Disputatio de aetate, qua conscripta est Historia Augusta. Diss. 12mo. viii, 123 pp. Leiden.
- Virgilius*. *Bucolica*. Texte latin établi et annoté par A. Waltz. 18mo. 131 pp. Avec facsimile des plus anciens manuscrits. Paris, Colin et Cie.
- Voigt*. Das sogenannte syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch. 12mo. 18 pp. Leipzig.
- Wetzstein*. Die Wandlung der stoischen Lehre unter ihren späteren Vertretern. (Schluss.) Progr. 4to. Neustrelitz.
- Weymar* (C.) Studien zu Apuleius und seinen Nachahmern. 12mo. 74 pp. München.
- Weissenborn* (H.) Die Berechnung des Kreis-Umfanges bei Archimedes und Leonardi Pisano. 8vo. 32 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 1 Mk. 50.
[Berliner Studien für classische Philologie. Band 14. Heft 3.]
- Westervick* (O.) De Plutarchi studiis Hesiodicis. Dissertatio. 8vo. 77 pp. Münster. Mk. 1.20.
- Wiegand* (T.) Die Puteolanische Bauinschrift sachlich erläutert. Diss. 8vo. Freiburg.
- Winckelmannsprogramm*. 17tes Hallisches. 4to. 82 pp. Plate. Halle, Niemeyer. Mk. 8.
[Contents: Robert, C. Die Iliupersis des Polygnot.]
- Xenophon*. *Anabasis und Hellenika in Auswahl*. Text und Commentar. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von Sorof. 2tes Bändchen *Anabasis* Buch V.-VII. und *Hellenika*. Text, mit mehreren Plänen, einer Einleitung zu den *Hellenika*, nebst Zeittafel und einem Verzeichnis der Eigennamen. 8vo. iv, 330 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 2.
— *Kommentar*. 8vo. 182 pp. Mk. 1.40.
- Eichler (G.) Die Redebilder in den Schriften Xenophons. Progr. 4to. Dresden. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Zielinski* (T.) August Nauek. Ein Bild seines Lebens und seiner Werke. 8vo. 65 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. Mk. 2.
[Extract: Jahresber. üb. d. Fortschritte des klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft.]